

The Council re-assembled at the Council Chamber, Fort St. George, at 11 a.m. on Saturday, the 26th day of March 1921, the Hon'ble Diwan Bahadur Sir P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., President, presiding.

I

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

[Order made by the President of the Madras Legislative Council under Standing Order No. 15—

(1) Printed copies of the questions and answers to be put and given at a meeting of the Council shall be placed on the Council table an hour before the President takes his seat.

(2) The questions shall be put and answered in the following manner :—

The Secretary shall call the name of each interpellator in alphabetical order, specify the serial numbers of his questions, and make a sufficient pause to allow him or any other member a reasonable opportunity of rising in his place if he is desirous of asking a supplementary question. Supplementary questions must be put immediately after the principal questions to which they relate.]

*Distribution of Publicity pamphlets.*

502 Q.—MR. A. D. M. BAVOTTI SAHIB : To ask the Hon'ble the Member for Finance whether he will take steps for the free distribution of all Publicity pamphlets regarding the Khilafat movements and the action taken by the Government of India on the subject, especially among the Mappillas of Ernad and Walluvanad taluks of Malabar.

A.—The Government understand that a considerable distribution of such pamphlets as the Honourable Member refers to is already made in Malabar but the special attention of the Publicity Officer will be drawn to the Honourable Member's question.

*Christian and Panchama students in Srivilliputtur Government Training School.*

503 Q.—MR. M. D. DEVADASS : To ask the Hon'ble the Minister for Education—

(a) if it is a fact that the Christian and Panchama students are compelled to occupy seats at a respectful distance from the high caste students in the Government Training School at Srivilliputtur, Ramnad district;

(b) if it is a fact that five out of eight Indian Christian and Panchama students were dismissed by the headmaster on the 16th instant under rule 121 of the Madras Educational Rules; and

(c) if it is a fact that the Panchama students are treated harshly and are abused by the headmaster and other teachers in the school.

A.—The Government have no information. The matter is being enquired into.

*Boycotting of Indian Christians in Kistna district.*

504 Q.—MR. A. T. PALMER : To ask the Hon'ble the Home Member if it is a fact that in certain parts of the Kistna district Indian Christians are boycotted and are not given employment in harvesting operations because they took part in polling; if so, to institute enquiries into the matter and take steps to protect the law-abiding Christians.

A.—The Government have no information, but will make enquiries. They would be grateful to the Honourable Member if he would communicate any information in his possession to the District Magistrate.

*Kistna reservoir project.*

505 Q.—DIWAN BAHADUR M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU : To ask the Hon'ble the Member for Revenue in what stage the Kistna reservoir project at present is and to state whether the Government will expedite the consideration of the scheme.

[26th March 1921]

A.—The Member of the Legislative Council is referred to the answer to question No. 488, asked by M.R.Ry. Rao Sahib P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu Garu.

*Transferred subjects.*

506 Q.—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: To ask the Hon'ble the Home Member—

(a) whether any, and, if so, what, Provincial subjects, or parts thereof, mentioned in Schedule II to the rules framed under section 45-A of the Government of India Act have not yet been transferred to the Ministers;

(b) if any have not been yet transferred, the reasons therefor.

A.—All the subjects classed as transferred in Schedule II to the rules framed under section 45-A of the Government of India Act have been transferred to the Ministers.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"May I know when the subject of light and feeder railways was transferred, and if there was any delay, the reasons therefor?"

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER:—"I am not aware, Sir, that there was any delay, but I will examine the question."

*Schools for criminal tribes in Bellary.*

507 Q.—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: To ask the Hon'ble the Law Member to state—

(a) the number of schools established for the benefit of the children of the criminal tribes in the Bellary district;

(b) the places where, and the areas in which, such schools are established; and

(c) the places where there are criminal settlements, but schools for their benefit have not yet been established.

A.—(a) There are nine elementary schools for the benefit of the children of criminal tribes in the Bellary district, eight under local boards and one under private management.

(b) The eight schools under local boards are situated in the under-mentioned places:—

Places where the schools are situated.

Taluks.

1. Kyarakatti	..	..	..	..	} Harpanahalli taluk
2. Sanganahalli	..	..	..	..	
3. Bande Basapur	..	..	..	..	
4. Mallaraikanahalli	..	..	..	..	} Kudligi taluk.
5. Chilakanapatti	..	..	..	..	
6. Nallapuram	..	..	..	..	} Hospet taluk.
7. Kothapalli near Somalapuram	..	..	..	..	
8. Rathi Bhavivanha	..	..	..	..	} Rayadrug taluk.

The Government have no information as to the exact place where the private aided school is located.

(c) Schools have been established in all the settlements in the Presidency.

*Preference of Advocates for District Munsif's post.*

508 Q.—Mr. P. VENKATASURBA RAO: To ask the Hon'ble the Law Member whether in selecting candidates for appointment as District Munsifs, Advocates are not preferred to others; if not, why.

A.—The Government have no information as the appointment of District Munsifs vests in the High Court.

The Council then resumed consideration of Demands for grants.



26th March 1921] [The Hon'ble Mr. A. Subbarayulu Reddiyar]

## II

### DEMAND FOR GRANTS.

#### DEMAND XVI--EDUCATION (NON-EUROPEAN).

The Hon'ble Diwan Bahadur A. SUBBARAYULU REDDIYAR:—"Sir, I move the Council for a grant not exceeding 143 lakhs under Demand XVI—Education—Non-European. Before starting the discussion of the resolutions, it behoves me, I may state frankly, to offer my congratulations to the Council for getting for the local boards the 9 lakhs that they were recently deprived of, or for the reasonable hopes we have of getting back the 9 lakhs for elementary school teachers. But that does not absolve the Local Boards from the need for putting into force the Elementary Education Act and the District Boards Act in order to be able to finance elementary education hereafter. May I also congratulate the Council that I, in all probability, shall be able to find funds for aided secondary education—I need not say how—but I have reasonable hopes of finding those funds."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT:—"In regard to the first three resolutions tabled respectively by Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyyar, Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao and Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju, His Excellency has decided that the allowance of Rs. 1,800 which is proposed to be reduced is a non-votable item. I have received His Excellency's orders. So those three items have to go out of the agenda."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"Sir, may I know with reference to that announcement whether any communication will be made to the members concerned as regards the grant which has been held to be non-votable."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT:—"This is His Excellency's order and I will read it out to the House, 'the allowance of Rs. 1,800 which, in resolutions Nos. 1, 2 and 3, Demand XVI, is proposed to be reduced is a non-votable item.' No reasons have been given and I have duly communicated His Excellency's decision to the House."

The first three motions which were disallowed were as follows:—

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—

1. *That under Education, 31-A (b) (i) the duty allowance of one Principal Rs. 1,800 be omitted (Budget page 122).*

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—

2. *That the following duty allowance be omitted:—*

31-A (b) (i) Education—Government Arts Colleges—

*Duty allowance of one Principal (voted) Budget*  
*page 122) ... .. Rs. 1,800*

Mr. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU:—

3. (1) *That the following items of duty allowance be omitted:—*

31-A (b) (i) Education—Government Arts Colleges—

*To Principal of one college which is a voted item*  
*(Budget page 122) ... .. Rs. 1,800*

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu did not then move the following motion which stood in his name and it was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn:—

4. *That the following duty allowance be omitted:—*

31-A (b) (iii) Education—University—Government Professional Colleges—  
 Teachers' Colleges—

*"Other duty allowance" Teachers' Colleges*  
*(Budget page 125) ... .. Rs. 120*

[Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar] [26th March 1921]

Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar being absent, the following motion standing in his name was deemed to have been withdrawn :—

5. *That under 31-A (b) (iii), the provision of Rs. 18,200 for stipends be reduced by Rs. 5,000 (Budget page 125).*

Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar being absent, the following motion standing against his name was deemed to have been withdrawn :—

6. *That under 31-A (b) (iii) the provision of Rs. 18,200 for stipends be reduced by Rs. 5,000 (Budget page 125).*

MR. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—“ I move—

‘ 7. *That under 31-A (b) (iii) Education, University—Government Professional Colleges, the provision of Rs. 18,200 for stipends be reduced by Rs. 5,000 (Budget page 125).*’

“ I do so in order to elicit information from Government whether they still think it necessary to give stipends to students who enter the Teachers' College at Saidapet from the Arts Colleges. I can understand, Sir, the necessity for encouraging teachers already in service, who may wish to better their qualifications by giving them stipends, but I doubt, Sir, if it is necessary to offer encouragement to graduates who are not in service to get themselves qualified for service in this department. This is not done in other departments, and in view of the fact that the stipends that we are now able to offer to men already in the service of Government, and of local bodies, are not very liberal, at any rate not enough to make these people not to feel the difficulty, or the difference in their income when they go for training, and taking into consideration the loss they are put to during their course at the Teachers' College and seeing that there are not sufficient funds to give them larger stipends, I think that the question may be examined whether it is necessary to give stipends to people who do not belong to any of these services but who are outsiders. If the matter is engaging the attention of Government, I would recommend that these stipends be confined only to people who are sent up for training after taking service, either under Government or under local bodies. With these observations, Sir, I beg that Government will find their way to examine the question.”

The Hon'ble Diwan Bahadur A. SUBBAEAYULU REDDIYAR :—“ I would accept, Sir, the recommendation to refuse stipends to those pupils that go from the B.A. class straight to the L.T. class, because they were accustomed to maintain themselves before that, and I do not see why they should not continue to maintain themselves. The rest are entitled to receive stipends.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The following motion standing in the name of Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar was not moved and was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

8. *That under 31-B (i) Education—Secondary—Government Secondary Schools, the provision for an English tutor for the hostel of Rs. 420 be deleted (Budget page 129).*

MR. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—“ Mr. President, I do not think very much is required to be said in support of the recommendation ‘ *That under 31-B (b) (i) Education—Secondary—Government Secondary Schools, the provision of Rupees 420 for an English tutor for the hostel be deleted (Budget page 129) Motion No. 9.*’ Students get their education in the college. Why in the hostel there should be a tutor for this same purpose I do not see. For that reason I ask that that item may be deleted.”



26th March 1921]

[Mr. M. C. Raja]

Mr. M. C. RAJA :—" I beg to move—

'10. *That under 31-B (i) Education—Secondary—Government Secondary Schools, the provision for an English tutor for the hostel of Rs. 420 be deleted (Budget page 129).*'

"Mr. President, I should like to know for which hostel the provision is wanted and also the nature of the work that this tutor is expected to do there. As a matter of fact, I do not know whether this is for the girls' hostel or for the boys' hostel, and also I should like to know why this special provision should be made only for this hostel and not for other hostels in the Presidency."

The Hon'ble Diwan Bahadur A. SUBBARAYULU REDDIYAR :—" Sir, this provision of Rs. 420 is for an English tutor to coach the widow scholarship-holders in the Vizagapatam hostel, the hostel attached to the Queen Mary's High School for Indian Girls at Vizagapatam. The object of this provision is to get these widows coached up to the standard of entering a higher class for which they are otherwise fit owing to their acquaintance with other languages. There are at present 17 Brahmans and 7 non-Brahmans in that hostel requiring tuition for that purpose. They are specially backward in English and are otherwise fit for a higher class. It is in order to improve them in English that they require a tutor like this."

Messrs. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar and M. C. Raja did not then press their motions Nos. 9 and 10 and they were by leave withdrawn.

Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar did not make the following motion which stood in his name :—

11. *That under 31-B (b) (i) Education—Secondary—Government Secondary Schools, the provision for an English tutor for the hostel, Rs. 420 be omitted (Budget page 129).*

The motion was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn.

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—" Mr. President, the next motion which stands against my name is—

'12. *That under 31-B (b) (i) the provision for two women specialists in physical instruction of Rs. 7,200 be omitted (Budget page 129).*'

"I do not know whether these two specialists are Sandows to be paid Rs. 7,200. If they are gymnastic instructors, even then I suppose women instructors on less than Rs. 400 and Rs. 300 a month could be had. It seems too extravagant to spend so much money for instructors in physical exercise."

Mr. M. C. RAJA :—" I beg to move—

'13. *That under 31-B (b) (i) the provision for two women specialists in physical instruction of Rs. 7,200 be omitted (Budget page 129).*'

"Sir, I think this is a very costly item. As a matter of fact, no expert is needed for our girls' schools to teach physical exercise. Moreover, I do not think at this stage we have a physical instructor for our boys' schools. I know there is one who is called the Assistant Physical Director, but he is not doing physical work at all, he is doing only scout work. As a matter of fact, I do not see why this special provision should be made for drilling women in physical exercise and why on the other side the boys' branch should be overlooked. Of course our idea is that we must encourage education, but we should not kill the feminine softness in women. Moreover the physical exercise which they ought to do at home—I mean the household exercises, just as drawing water from the well or grinding curry stuff or pounding rice—all this will, I think, help them to a

[Mr. M. C. Raja]

[26th March 1921]

great extent to develop their bodies, and also in the evenings they can have a little walk or a little badminton or tennis. But I do not see any necessity for specially getting two costly experts to look after the exercises of our young ladies in school. Moreover, Sir, we are not going to make them amazons or suffragettes to break the windows of our Ministers."

Mr. R. G. GRIEVE :—" Mr. President, Mr. Raja stated that no provision was made for a Physical Director for boys' schools. I think anybody who has followed recent educational activities not only in Madras but also in the mufassal must have seen the admirable work done by Dr. Noehren in connexion with physical training in boys' schools. We want now a lady trained in up-to-date methods so that the many Hindu girls who grow up at present unsound may receive during their early years remedial treatment and remedial measures which will make for their physical health and well-being. I am sure that no member of this House who has got the best interest of girls' education at heart will fail to support this provision. In this connexion I appeal to my two honourable friends opposite who are authorities on medical matters and ask them to give me their hearty support. It may be desirable to start only with one lady in this connexion ; but the point is that we should have somebody who is fully trained and who is fully qualified to look after this very important branch of women's education."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—" Mr. President, Sir, the physical development of women is absolutely necessary. If we take the total number of men and women suffering from consumption, we find that 75 per cent of the number are women. That is due to want of proper physical training and to the poor development of chest muscles. Many cases of spinal curvature, adenoids and ailments such as consumption, are due to want of open air exercises. That is one of the great drawbacks of Indian women. Most Indian women are not in the habit of going out to take open air exercise. So they do not develop their bodies, and their lung muscles. That is why we want, Sir, a woman specialist to help the development of the girls' physique. Every one in this House will admit that women are capable of doing all sorts of physical and mental work just like men. Women are now engaged in all kinds of work. They want franchise; there are among women doctors, lawyers and merchants and probably in course of time they will come and sit by our side as legislators. Such being the case, I do not see any reason why we should deny them physical training. Physical training is absolutely necessary for the development of brain. Without a good body, the mind cannot develop. So, Mr. President, if we are anxious to have healthy children, we must give physical development to our women. We must have at least one woman specialist for the purpose. Indian women do not like to undergo training under men instructors. That is the reason why I strongly oppose this motion."

Rao Bahadur Dr. C. B. RAMA RAO :—" Mr. President, Sir, this is a very important question from the national point of view. I consider it one of the most important, because on the proper training of our girls in schools will greatly depend the proper development of the physique of our future mothers. Unless we provide for it at an early stage of life no real work is possible. Take for instance a woman who has already given birth to a child at an early age. She is practically hopeless because her frame has become so firmly set that no further expansion of the bony frame is possible. An all-round development is necessary and it is possible and easy if it is arranged for early in life. That is possible only in schools. Since men instructors are out of question in so delicate a matter, women are necessary. To get women who understand the physiology and the



26th March 1921]

[Dr. C. B. Rama Rao]

anatomy of the body and who can watch the development and the progress of the children is not an easy thing at the present stage. I do not suppose that even the amount now provided will secure a sufficiently cultured and knowing lady to manage this difficult task. I therefore heartily support the proposal to entertaining the best possible lady trainer."

MR. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" Mr. President, Sir, I have given notice of a motion which runs as follows :—

' 14. That under 31-B (b) (i) Education—Secondary—Government Secondary Schools, the grant of Rs. 7,200 provided for two women specialists in physical instruction be reduced by Rs. 4,800 providing only one (Budget page 129).'

"So far as I have been able to follow the discussion, all are in favour of employing a lady specialist. Even Mr. Grieve says on behalf of Government that we want a lady specialist for training. There is absolutely no difficulty to get a sufficient number of women trained here by having one woman specialist. But there is no necessity for bringing two people from outside for this training. Moreover the appointment of two instructors won't be enough for the whole Presidency. What is wanted is that a number of instructors should be appointed, at least one for each institution. All these can be trained by the woman specialist who will come here. I do not see therefore any necessity for two teachers. Even if two specialists are employed they can only be in Madras, and I do not think they will be available for the whole Presidency. So even though I am in favour of employing specialists for physical instruction, I do not think it is necessary to make the provision made in the budget. I think the provision for one of the two instructors may be cut off."

MR. R. G. GRIEVE :—" Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar proposes to cut off Rs. 400 a month which leaves only Rs. 200 a month and we shall not be able to get a really qualified woman specialist for this low salary. If he leaves it to the Minister and withdraws his motion, he will look to it."

MR. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—" I beg leave to withdraw my motion (Motion No. 12)."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions Nos. 13 and 15 standing in the names of Mr. M. C. Raja and Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar, respectively, were also by leave withdrawn.

Motion No. 15 ran as follows :—

' That under 31-B (b) (i) Education—Secondary—Government Secondary Schools, the provision of Rs. 7,200 for two women specialists be omitted (Budget page 129).'

MR. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" All that I can say is, let one woman specialist be appointed. I do not want now to insist that the lady ought to be employed only on the lower salary and not on the higher salary. What I say is that provision need be made for only one woman."

The Hon'ble Diwan Bahadur A. SUBBARAYULU REDDIYAR :—" Sir, I have no objection to content myself with retaining one of them on Rs. 400 a month for the present."

The Motion No. 14 of Mr. Ramalingam Chettiyar was by leave withdrawn.

The following motion standing in the name of Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu was deemed to have been withdrawn as the member did not move it :—

' 16. That in the demand under 31-B (b) (i) Education—Secondary—Government Secondary Schools, the grant of Rs. 18,000 proposed for the opening of additional Government Secondary Schools be omitted (Budget page 129).'

[Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar]

[26th March 1921]

The following motion standing in the name of Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar was deemed to have been withdrawn as the member did not move it:—

‘17. That under 31-B (b) (i) the budget provision for opening additional Secondary Schools should be reduced from Rs. 18,000 to Rs. 12,000 (Budget page 129).’

MR. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR :—“I move—

‘18. That under 31-B (b) (iii) the budget provision for opening new board high and middle schools including revision of establishment should be reduced from Rs. 3,79,000 to Rs. 3,49,000 (Budget page 129).’

“Sir, I wish that my object in asking for a reduction of the budget provision for opening new board high and middle schools including the revision of establishment from Rs. 3,79,000 to Rs. 3,49,000 should not be misunderstood. I do not mean to say that district boards should not open new schools nor am I distrustful or suspicious of their educational activity. All that I mean is that the existing schools ought to be rendered more efficient than they are. One way of making them efficient is certainly to extend their sphere of usefulness and to see that instead of one section in each form two or three sections are tacked on to each of the different forms. For if some schools in important localities are made really very useful, students do not grudge travelling some miles to attend those schools. Secondly, Sir, in the localities where these district boards wish to open schools, there already exist some aided institutions. These aided institutions are very badly in need of help. It was only the other day I had a moving appeal supported with sufficient facts and figures put into my hands. That was in connexion with the St. Mary's High School, Madura. It will be seen that a paltry additional grant of Rs. 300 a year will give that school a fresh lease of life. I know there are a number of aided schools which seem to be slowly starved out of existence. So, then, the wisest policy will be for us to see that schools that have done very useful work, that have rendered yeomen service in the field of education, schools that have hitherto helped and not hampered Government, get greater encouragement than they seem to have from the department. I know there is a growing discontent that Government do not allot special teaching grants to aided schools. For, without these special teaching grants, it is impossible for headmasters of aided schools to revise the scale of fees given to their teachers and to place them, if not exactly on a footing of equality with the teachers of the Government schools at least on a footing not very far below theirs. I was asked by several associations of teachers to see that in reducing grants so liberally given to Government institutions, the way at least is prepared later on for a kind of provision being made for them.

“Again, in many of these aided schools, headmasters have already begun to reduce the establishments. Some teachers have been given notice also. A new party has entered the field and is laying the axe at the root of western culture. These aided schools are on the one hand asked not to apply for grants and on the other they are not allowed liberal grants. It is certainly aided schools that deserve encouragement. I do not mean to say that by making provision for taluk board schools you will be discouraging aided schools. My contention is where the educational needs of the locality are fully met by an aided school already in existence, it is a sound and good policy for taluk boards or for Government to see that their own schools are not brought very near or that they don't go on opening schools. There is also another reason which makes me press for this reduction



2-th March 1921] [Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar]

What we really want to have is quality more than quantity. We have a twofold tragedy enacted every day under our very eyes. We have the tragedy of a number of young men who have sold away or mortgaged their lands and incurred heavy expenses for their education and have entered Government service, clamouring for a living wage. Their cry is the cry for more bread. On the other hand, we have the tragedy of a number of young men passing through the secondary school course and coming out without even a Secondary School-Leaving Certificate. Is it not a tragedy that the percentage of passes in the Secondary School-Leaving Certificate Examination is so low as 20, 25 and 30 per cent? Under normal conditions the percentage ought to be at least 50, if not 60, 70 or 80. So then if more help and encouragement is to be given it should be given to aided institutions. If the scale of fees to teachers in Government schools could be revised on more liberal lines and if improved methods of instruction were introduced, it should be possible to improve the quality of education and avert this twofold tragedy. So, for these reasons I want to move this resolution. It is only asking for a modest reduction."

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—"The Honourable Member who moved this resolution has depicted to us a gloomy picture of the pay and prospects of the teachers in aided schools and the picture has not been very much overdrawn. Neither the Minister for Education nor the Director of Public Instruction nor I myself who have received numerous petitions from teachers in aided schools and teachers' associations are likely to overlook the importance of this consideration. At the same time financially we are at a very low ebb. And the Honourable Member will realize that so far as aided institutions are concerned Government help is only secondary in its very nature and essentially and primarily these institutions have to fall back on their own resources. However that may be in introducing this grant, the Honourable the Minister has already said that so far as practicable it is his endeavour to find that amount which was distributed to aided schools last year and we have every hope that we shall find this amount.

"As regards this provision of Rs. 3,79,000 it is not intended that schools under the management of local bodies should be increased. We recognize the necessity of strengthening the schools already in existence and of finding better pay for the teachers already employed and not to entrust our discretion by providing new schools. The provision is intended to revise the scale of fees in board and municipal high schools or to open new forms where it is absolutely essential. As an illustration a school which had the fourth form in the current year must have the fifth form next year; otherwise the students will not know what to do. It is with a view to strengthen the institutions already existing by a revision of pay or by throwing open additional forms that this provision is made. If this provision is cut down, then a number of institutions will cease to open new forms that are absolutely essential and a number of schools will have to be closed. In spite of our sympathy for the teachers that is a catastrophe which neither of us are prepared to face."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"I beg to oppose this motion. I believe it was not the object of the Honourable Member to discourage the opening of the municipal and district board schools under public management. If the Honourable Member wanted help for secondary education it ought not to be by reducing the grants for schools under public management. It has been pointed out at the outset by the Honourable the Minister that he will find funds for rendering aid to aided schools. Under these circumstances it seems to me that

[Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu] [26th March 1921]

the Honourable Member has chosen a wrong item for cutting down. The Hon'ble Mr. Ramaswami Mudaliyar who is always trying to make out that the Ministry has a continuity of policy has failed in this matter. For the last two years provision has been made for the opening of secondary schools through the agency of local bodies. I know that 49 schools were opened in one year and 50 in the last year. I respectfully submit that this is the policy that has been deliberately decided upon by the late Government and I regret to say that that continuity has not been kept up. I must submit that it is as much necessary to secure the expansion of secondary education not only by rendering aid to private institutions but also by rendering aid to institutions maintained by local bodies. Honourable Members will remember—those Honourable Members who were in the Council during the time of Minto-Morley Reforms—that the whole question of the policy of the secondary education had been examined at a great length and it was found that private effort had entirely failed to keep pace with the demand for secondary education. The late Government has come to a deliberate conclusion that the expansion of secondary education should be undertaken by the State through the agency of the local bodies. I am therefore entirely opposed to this motion. I do not know why the Honourable the Minister has chosen to cut down this grant which has been made for the last two years for the purpose of starting more secondary schools through local bodies."

Diwan Bahadur T. DESIKA ACHARIYAR :—" Mr. President, I do not understand exactly what the object of the mover of this resolution is. Apparently he wanted to draw the attention of the Government to the necessity for aid to schools under private management. I do not for a moment think that he entertains the idea of preventing the growth and expansion of secondary education under the auspices of local boards. Personally, Sir, I am sure this House knows that in each district there is scope for more secondary schools and there are a large number of places in which secondary schools could be opened. Applications have been received from time to time by Presidents of District Boards for the opening of secondary schools in places where elementary schools had till now satisfied local wants. And every year applications of this sort have to be refused on the ground of want of funds. As pointed out by Mr. Ramachandra Rao, no provision has been made for additional secondary schools in the coming year. The provision for continuing the existing schools cannot in any way be considered as anything new or unduly large. As pointed out by Mr. Ramaswami Mudaliyar, the reduction of the grant under this head will mean that some of these schools must be reduced to a lower standard and some closed altogether. I do not think that Mr. Arpudaswami Udaiyar will press this resolution, he having achieved his object, viz., that of drawing the attention of the Government with reference to the necessity for help to aided schools. My own opinion is that he will be far from being against help being given by Government to district board schools."

MR. A. T. PALMER :—" Sir, I have great pleasure in endorsing every syllable of what Mr. Arpudaswami Udaiyar has said. There is no doubt whatsoever that schools are being started in this Presidency in every possible place. I have one in my mind at present and that is the school at Samalkot. Now, this is a very small place about two miles from another place called Peddapur, where there is a fine mission school. They have started a school here and I do not know what the strength of this school is going to be. I know that it would cost a great deal to the local board to maintain it. As Mr. Arpudaswami Udaiyar has said, the aided schools are suffering a great deal; the teachers are clamouring for more pay and



26th March 1921]

[Mr. A. T. Palmer]

an ill-paid teacher is a nuisance. We need not care for the troubles the teacher has to undergo. But let us look at the effect that such a teacher has on education. Now, Sir, here is a man who is half-starved and he comes to the school with a very sour mind. It must not be a surprise to us to see that his work is slipshod. It is no wonder that only such a small percentage of candidates for the Secondary School-Leaving Certificate Examination pass. We cannot expect efficient work from teachers who are poorly paid. I am very sorry that the Government have not provided any allotment for the teaching grants to aided schools. I will be failing in duty if I do not point it out to the Government and see that justice is done by it."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"I very strongly oppose this motion. I have very great sympathy with the mover of this resolution when he states that aided secondary schools require larger aid, and it is certainly necessary to give larger grants in aid of aided secondary schools. But that should not be done at the sacrifice of other institutions. It is not possible to have too many secondary schools in the country. It is highly desirable also to raise the existing standards in secondary schools to higher standards. I submitted, Sir, the other day in connexion with the general discussion of the budget that the future industrial development of the country depended very much on those who had received the secondary education.

"Those who have received collegiate education generally do not go in for the study of industrial subjects and those who have acquired only training in primary schools do not possess the necessary capacity to acquire knowledge which is requisite for the study of industrial subjects so that the development of secondary education on a very large scale is highly essential for the future industrial development of the country. The mover of this resolution stated that the quality of education suffered very much. I sympathize with him in that also. It is certainly desirable if it is possible to have a very high quality of education in the case of those who are taught in secondary schools, but it is more essential to have a larger number of youths educated in secondary schools than to have a smaller number very well educated in secondary schools. It is certainly desirable to supply a smaller number of persons with very good dishes on a well-equipped table, but I would certainly prefer a very large number of persons being given coarse food to supplying all sorts of delicacies to a smaller number of persons. For these reasons I oppose this resolution very strongly."

Mr. S. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"I should like to associate myself with Mr. Krishnan Nayar in his insistence that secondary education is important. I do not oppose Mr. Arputaswami Udaiyar's motion except in the spirit that aided schools ought not to get grants to the exclusion of board schools. Aided schools as well as board schools should get increased aid from State funds. The method which he has adopted of asking the Government to give more funds to aided schools and less to board schools is not a correct method. There is not the slightest doubt that aided schools should receive far more attention than they have been receiving in the past. After all Government schools and board schools must be more expensive and education cannot be spread by Government and board institutions quite so much as by aided institutions. I therefore think that far larger aid should be given to aided institutions than to the other institutions. That does not mean in the least that the policy of having some Government secondary schools or expansion of board schools should be stopped, but there is not the slightest doubt that there is a general feeling that secondary education cannot make any progress

[Mr. S. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

[26th March 1921]

unless the pay of the teachers and unless the aid which is made to the secondary institutions are both increased. There is not the slightest doubt either that unless secondary education is improved neither university education nor any kind of progress is going to be made. I think secondary education requires really more attention than elementary instruction. It has been the fashion to enthuse over elementary education. I agree that without elementary education nothing can be done, because it is the basis of secondary education. But secondary education is the real backbone. Unless you have such a thing as a vitalising system of education it is impossible that anything like a transformation in the life and business of the country will exhibit itself which will enable it to hold up its head amongst nations. In this state of things, I appeal to the Government and the Members of the Council to see, if not next year, at least the year after, that the policy which has been hitherto pursued of granting niggardly aids to secondary schools is discontinued."

Mr. T. SIVASANKARAM PILLAI:—"Mr. President, I rise to oppose this motion. One reason which the mover has advanced in support of the amendment was that too many secondary schools are not so good as a fewer number of efficient schools. Evidently he has taken the view that what money is available should be utilized for improving the quality of the schools instead of increasing their number. I wish to differ from him in this. We want to manufacture elementary school teachers in several centres of the presidency and secondary schools are the manufacturingories. We have got the Elementary Education Act to work. We have to extend compulsion under the Act. In this view of things, we have to be prepared beforehand for the increasing demand in the number of elementary school teachers. If we want to do this, we should have as many secondary schools as possible spread over the country. I would even, if it is left to me, suggest that more funds be allotted under this head. With these few remarks, I would oppose this resolution."

The Rev. E. M. MACPHAIL:—"Mr. President, the point of view from which we look at the method of elementary education is this. We find that Government seems to be regardless of aided institutions when it is dividing up the money that is available. It is not that we wish to cut down what is being given to other institutions. But what we do remark is, we are doing more useful work and a work which is being recognized and which has been done as efficiently and much more cheaply by us than by aided institutions. That work is not recognized when there is going to be an increase in expenditure; what we find as a matter of fact is that while there is increased expenditure in all departments of Government education and local fund education the aided teachers and lecturers in aided colleges are left severely alone, and no increases are given to them. That is why we complain. We are not complaining that other people are getting more. But what we are complaining is that there seems to be absolutely no consideration shown to us. I consider that this is a very serious state of affairs in this part of the country where such a large part of the education given is given in aided institutions. It is high time for the Government to make up its mind and say definitely what its policy is going to be.

"One Member of the Ministry in this House gave expression a few days ago to a policy which is absolutely opposed to what has been the policy of Government hitherto. I am referring to Mr. Subbarayan's speech. I do not know whether he spoke for the Ministry when he said that aided colleges should receive nothing, but that the Presidency College should be kept up as a model college. I want to



26th March 1921]

[Rev. E. M. Macphail]

ask the Minister for Education if this is going to be the policy of the Government in the future."

The Hon'ble Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—"It is the individual opinion of Dr. Subbarayan and not the policy of the Government."

The Rev. E. M. MACPHAIL (*continuing*) :—"Because it is opposed directly to the policy of the Government, we should like that Government should show some sympathy in some practical way.

"We want the Government not merely to sympathize with us but to remember us when they are dividing the funds. I would ask the members of this House to study the report of the Director of Public Instruction and to compare the cost of education in the different colleges and aided schools respectively under Government."

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"The purpose of the provision made for opening new board high schools has been sufficiently explained by the Minister to this House. In regard to the fact that aided schools have not received as much help as they have been receiving lately at the hands of Government, I feel that we need not hereafter press this motion as the Council Secretary Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar thinks these funds are for the purpose of strengthening the staff and the expansion of the activity of the existing institutions. Now turning to the resolution we find a demand has been made to cut down Rs. 3,79,000 to Rs. 3,49,000 thereby leaving a much insignificant sum of Rs. 30,000 and odd. If this resolution is carried we will be landed in a quagmire. It will either paralyse the activity of the existing institutions or sound their death-knell. The question is whether it would be prudent on the part of the Council to commit itself to a course of policy which in my humble opinion, I beg to state, will not redound to the credit or honour of this House. Therefore with these observations, I beg to resist the motion."

Mr. P. C. MUTHU CHETTIYAR :—

"இந்த அபிப்பிராயத்தில் (Demand No. XVI, motions 16 and 17) ரூ. 18,000 போட்டிருப்பது ரொம்ப குறைந்தது. ஒருக்கால் ஒரு figure விட்டிருக்குமோ என்று யோசிக்கிறேன். இந்த சபையில் லக்ஷக்கணக்காக அனாதை வசியமாகப்போட்ட அபிப்பிராயங்களுக்கு அவ்வளவு ஆகையேனில்லை. இந்த விஷயத்தில் மிஷனரிகள் (missionaries) ஆகையிப்பது ரொம்ப ஆச்சரியம். அவர்கள் இந்த நாட்டுக்கு ஏராளமான பணத்தைக் கொண்டுவந்து ஒரு idea வை வைத்துக்கொண்டு, கிராமம் கிராமங்களாக உபநியாசங்களும் பண்ணி செலவிட்டு வருகிறார்கள். அவர்கள் இதில் வீரும்புவது தகாதது. ஏனென்றால் இந்தியர்கள் சம்பந்தமாய் 18,000 ரூபாய்தான் பட்டுஜெட்டில் போட்டிருப்பது அவர்களின் துர்பாக்கியமே. குறைந்தது ரூ. 50,000 ஆக ஆக்கவேண்டியதற்கு அவசியமிருக்கிறது என்பதை இந்தசபையோர்கள் அறியலாம்."

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—"The Honourable Member is speaking about the previous resolution. It would be well if the Honourable Member's attention is drawn to this fact."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—"It is already finished. The Honourable Member will please resume his seat."

The Hon'ble Mr. P. Ramarayaningar rose to explain the policy of the Government in regard to this question.

[The Hon'ble the President]

[26th March 1921]

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT:—"The Hon'ble the Minister will please resume his seat. He may take some other opportunity to explain the policy of the Government."

The motion No. 18 was by leave withdrawn.

Mr. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR moved:—

'19. That under 31-B (b) (iv) Education—Secondary, the provision of Rs. 14,580 for widows' scholarships be reduced by Rs. 100 (Budget, page 129).'

In doing so, he said:—"I request for information from the Government as to how these widows' scholarships of Rs. 14,580 are distributed among widows. I want to be furnished with the number of widows from the various communities that are recipients of these scholarships. I request the Government to distribute these scholarships among poor widows of the various castes and communities and may I request the Government to extend this to non-widows too."

The Hon'ble Diwan Bahadur A. SUBBARAYULU REDDIYAR:—"I have anticipated all these questions. These three resolutions are framed for that purpose I understand. These resolutions bear upon the widows' home, I believe, on the Marina. The widows' home is said to be a Brahman widows' home generally. As a matter of fact I know it ought not to go by that name. The lady in the direction of this home is Mrs. Drysdale for whom I have personally very great regard. She has employed almost all her time in the evolution of female education, and her activities are of an excellent character. Having heard in this connexion of the excellent manner in which the Ramakrishna home was being conducted at Mylapore, I mentioned this to Mrs. Drysdale one morning, took her with me to inspect the home. The home consisted of 40 pupils, 25 Brahmans and 15 non-Brahmans. I was assured that all the 40 lodged in the same house and messed at the same table, except that a sentimental difference was introduced by throwing a cloth between the two sets while eating. I looked at it approvingly. Mrs. Drysdale also looked at it so. She told me that it was not the way in which the home at the Ice House was being conducted but that she had no objection to adopt the same principle there. So with those ideas in our head we drove straight to the Students' home at the Ice House and Mrs. Drysdale came to the conclusion that the system adopted in the Ramakrishna home must be adopted there as well and that she had no objection and as a matter of fact there was no such thing as Brahman widows' home according to her opinion. So far as I know it was so, it was a common home for widows and the non-Brahman widows could not be had then according to her. It was understood between us that the Students' Home at Ice House must be conducted on the same lines as Ramakrishna home. So the enquiry is answered by my statement that the Students' Home at the Ice House is of the same character as the Ramakrishna home for boys and that the principles adopted in treating the widows there will be those adopted in the case of the Ramakrishna home and everything will get on smoothly. That was the understanding we came to, myself and Mrs. Drysdale.

"As regards the number of scholarships there are 59 scholarships at the Ice House for Brahman widows and 9 for non-Brahman widows. I believe that will satisfy the enquiring member as to how many scholarships there are. While I am taking this opportunity of expressing my sincere gratitude to Mrs. Drysdale for the excellent way in which she had been managing the home, I take this opportunity also to entreat the several members of the various communities concerned in South India to bear patiently till I give them the next building which is rising now for accommodation for all castes. It is too soon to expect that



26th March 1921] [The Hon'ble Mr. A. Subbarayulu Reddiyar]

Hindus and Christians will mix in dining and lodging. Therefore I have taken the liberty, thinking I shall be allowed that liberty, of arranging accommodation in the next building which is coming up and which is brand new."

Mr. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—"Sir, I request the Government to assure me that there are poor widows among those that mess there."

The Hon'ble Diwan Bahadur A. SUBBARAYULU REDDIYAR :—"Poor widows of all classes are the only ones that have accommodation there."

Mr. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—"Then I withdraw my motion, Sir."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The following motion, which stood in the name of Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar, was not moved and was deemed to have been withdrawn :—

'20. That under 31-B (b) (4) Education—Secondary, Scholarships in Secondary Schools, the provision of Rs. 14,580 for widows' scholarships be reduced by Rs. 100 (Budget, page 129).'

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—"Mr. President, Sir, my object in giving notice of this resolution is as the amount of reduction indicates, to draw attention to certain irregularities in what I consider to be the management of the institution. It is not that I am wanting in sympathy for the unfortunate people for whom these scholarships are intended, but I do ask the House to consider whether in dealing with these unfortunate beings a distinction is not being made by the officers of the Government which ought not to be made at all. I refer to the fact that though these scholarships are given both to Brahman widows and non-Brahman widows and both classes of widows pay for their board and lodging, the Brahman widows are installed in a place, which is a palace. It was a Raja's residence before it became the property of the Government, where these Brahman widows are lodged, whereas the unfortunate non-Brahman widows who pay the same amount both for board and lodging are being kept in some back portion of Triplicane which is far from healthy. Well, Sir, are the moneys which are being paid to these widows to be used to perpetuate a distinction which we all blame Manu for having instituted? I remember when I was a boy, this palace where the Brahman widows are being lodged bore the honoured name of 'Kernan's Castle' and there was an Arbitration Court. I do not know what arbitration work was done there, but I suspect that the arbitrators have passed an award that while one class of unfortunate widows is to enjoy that princely building, the other class should be kept in a very inferior place. This is the difference of treatment which we find there. But, having regard to the fact the Hon'ble Mr. Subbarayulu Reddiyar has given an assurance that it is now proposed to build another building close by where the other unfortunate class of beings will be lodged, I beg to withdraw the motion."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"The Honourable Member has not moved his resolution, Sir."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—"Has the Honourable Member moved the resolution? I think he must formally move the resolution first as he has delivered a speech."

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—"Then I move—

'21. That under 31-B (b) (4) Education—Secondary, the provision for widows' scholarships be reduced by Rs. 100 (Budget, page 129).'

[The Hon'ble Mr. A. Subbarayulu Reddiyar] [26th March 1921]

The Hon'ble Diwan Bahadur A. SUBBARAYULU REDDIYAR :—“ I distinctly stated, Sir, that it was by a misnomer called ‘ Brahman widows’ home’ and the building that I was referring to is rising next door to it and is a building meant for all classes. That is all that I have to say.”

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHATTIYAR :—“ I beg to withdraw my resolution.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The following motions were not moved and were therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—

22. *That the following items of duty allowance be omitted :—*

31-C (b) Education—Primary—Government—Primary Schools—

*Duty allowance to Headmasters (Boys’ Schools)*

(Budget, page 131) ... .. Rs. 3,084

*Duty allowance to teachers (Girls’ Schools) (Budget, page 131)* ... .. Rs. 70,362

Mr. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—

23. *Under 31-C (b) Education—Primary—Government—Primary Schools—*

*To Headmasters (Budget, page 131)* ... .. Omit Rs. 3,084

*For Girls—*

*To Teachers (Budget, page 131)* ... .. Omit Rs. 70,362

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

24. *That in 31-C (b) Education—Primary—Government—Primary Schools, Rs. 70,362, duty allowance to teachers in girls’ schools be deleted (Budget, page 131).*

Sriman BISVANATH DAS then made the following motion :—

‘ 25. *That the demands in detailed account No. 31-C (b) (ii) “ Building grants to Primary Schools” Rs. 71,000, and detailed account No. 31-C (b) (ii) “ Payment to local bodies in support of sessional schools” Rs. 49,000 be reduced by Rs. 35,000 and Rs. 24,500 respectively (Budget, page 132).*

In doing so, he said :—“ Sir, as for the first part of the motion I am satisfied with the information given by the Director of Public Instruction. As for the second part I should like to have some information. It is this. We have so many higher elementary schools in different parts of the country. We have already enhanced the salaries of the teachers to attract better men. Is it not possible for the Government to have these sessional school students trained up in the higher elementary schools and thus save this money which can be directed to other purposes which are more important and useful? It is for this, Sir, that I would like to have an answer from the Government.”

Mr. R. G. GRIEVE :—“ In regard to this motion, Sir, I have only to deal with the second part relating to sessional schools. These schools are scattered in different parts of the Presidency and serve the purpose of preparing a large number of wholly unqualified persons who are at present teaching in elementary schools for subsequent admission into the full training course. There are persons in elementary schools who have no general educational qualifications whatever and it is very undesirable that such people should be in charge of the education of the people of this Presidency. Obviously when they themselves are not adequately educated, the education that they can impart must be useless. Of course some day in the future when elementary school teachers are well paid and well qualified this class of person will disappear altogether and will not be found in these schools



26th March 1921]

[Mr. R. G. Grieve]

at all. But so long as we have got to put up with the material we have got, it is our duty to improve that material to the greatest possible extent. Accordingly in the case of these wholly unqualified persons, they are first admitted into sessional school in their district. This gives them a modicum of general education and also a few hints as to methods of teaching. After successfully passing through such a course he subsequently secures admission into a training school and in due time becomes fit to be a teacher. I think it would be unsound at the present time to abolish these sessional schools. Those members of this Council who are presidents of district boards or taluk boards must be well aware that they are doing useful and valuable work."

Sriman BISVANATH DAS :—" We know, Sir, that they are doing useful and valuable work, but at the same time I do realize that this is an unnecessary source of expense both to the Government and to the local boards. I therefore ask the Government just to have a sort of experiment in certain parts of one district, at least, so as to see if these sessional school students could be trained up in higher elementary schools. I fail to understand what difference there is at present in the teaching staff or at least between the headmaster of the sessional school and the higher elementary school headmaster. Therefore, Sir, I would just appeal to the Government to have a sort of experiment in certain parts of the district and with some assurance on the matter, Sir, I would withdraw my motion."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—" Has the Director of Public Instruction any assurance to give ?"

Mr. R. G. GRIEVE :—" I am not prepared to give that assurance at all."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—" Does the Honourable Member press his resolution ?"

Sriman BISVANATH DAS :—" I will withdraw, Sir."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" Sir, I beg to move —

' 26. That the demand of Rs. 6,00,000 under 31-C (b) (ii), for expansion of elementary education for meeting the cost of district educational councils be reduced by one lakh (Budget page 132).'

" My main object in making this motion is to find out from the Government—"

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" May I rise to a point of order, Sir. The resolution suggests that the demand of Rs. 6,00,000 for the expansion of elementary education for meeting the cost of district educational councils be reduced by one lakh. But the entry in the budget is for the expansion of elementary education and for meeting the cost of district educational councils. May I ask, through you, Sir, whether the Honourable Member is aware that the allotment is for two purposes ; his resolution suggests only one."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I am aware of it, Sir."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—" Has the Honourable Member any objection to insert the word 'and' before the word 'for' ?"

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I have no objection. The first point on which I should like to have information is as to what establishments the district educational councils are going to have if elementary education is to be expanded through these district educational councils, because it seems to me that we must have more funds than are provided for in this item. I under-

[Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu]

[26th March 1921]

stood that the Hon'ble Mr. Grieve once informed me that the establishments to be provided for running these new district educational councils would cost about a lakh of rupees. If there are any revised figures, I should like to know what these new district educational councils are to cost us and whether the administrative arrangements in connexion with them are going to cost us.

"As regards the remaining portion of this grant I should like to know from the Hon'ble the Minister as to what necessity there would be for the existing establishments if these new educational councils are to be decentralized bodies for the purpose of undertaking the duties done at the Central Office. I wish to know whether the establishment of these new education councils which will hereafter take up the administration of elementary education in the districts will involve the abolition of one of the Deputy Directorships."

"The third matter upon which I should like to have information is as to how this amount of 6 lakhs has been arrived at. The new educational councils are not in existence as yet. We do not know what educational cesses they are going to levy. All I wish to know is whether this allotment of elementary education would be spent irrespective of the amount of cesses that might be raised. I am anxious to secure at least some continuance of the policy in regard to spending funds on elementary education. This question of finding funds for elementary education has been urged in this Council a number of years and the Government have committed themselves to a policy of expanding their expenditure year after year. I should like to know what it is that is proposed to be done assuming that the new educational councils are not able immediately to put on their cesses equivalent to the Government grant. I hope that the Government would find their way to spending 6 lakhs or as much as they can give on elementary education. These are the three points which I wish to raise in connexion with the new educational council."

The Hon'ble Diwan Bahadur A. SUBBARAYULU REDDIYAR:—"Since the budget has been prepared I have had an opportunity to look into the matter myself and the result of it is we have to spend Rs. 45,000 on the educational council per year. As regards the Deputy Director, I am not in a position to say now that I can dispense with him. We will have to try and see how the educational council works before we can arrive at a decision that the Deputy Director could be discontinued."

"Then as regards the 6 lakhs it is only a rough estimate and I cannot get the details now. But I can certainly guarantee that the amount will not be reduced."

Mr. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU:—"Sir, this item has two divisions. I wish to know what the policy of the Government is going to be regarding expenditure on elementary education. Hitherto the expenditure on elementary education is done by aid to aided schools or by supporting new schools through local bodies. I wish to know what the policy of this Government will be regarding expenditure on elementary education."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"Sir, as I was responsible until a few months ago for the policy in regard to elementary education, perhaps my Honourable Colleague will not object if I venture on suggestions as to the future. I imagine, Sir, that there will for the immediate present be no marked difference between the policy of the past and the policy of the future. With regard to future developments, one of the first objects of the Government will be to consult the district educational councils, which it is now proposed to constitute under the Elementary Education Act. One of the primary functions of these educational



26th March 1921] [The Hon'ble Sir Lionel Davidson]

councils is to levy cesses for the expansion of elementary education with the aid of contributions from Government. But it is surely premature to expect the Hon'ble the Minister for Education to enunciate the policy of Government. This is a matter regarding which he must naturally consult the newly-created educational councils. The six lakhs which was entered under this head is, I may say, a lump provision roughly calculated at three times the amount of the annual increment which this Government have promised to give. My Hon'ble friend Mr. Ramachandra Rao probably recollects the occasion when it was promised that there should be an yearly increment of two lakhs to the grant for the expansion of elementary education. Notwithstanding the great pecuniary difficulties of this year we have managed to find for the Educational Department a sum of six lakhs or three times the promised increment."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" Before I withdraw this motion, I believe I can take it as an assurance that, pending the formation of these new educational councils and the cesses that they are likely to raise, this amount of six lakhs will be spent on elementary education."

The Hon'ble Diwan Bahadur A. SUBBARAYULU REDDIYAR :—" I say, yes."

The motion was by leave of Council withdrawn.

The next motion standing in the name of Mr. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR was as follows :—

27. *That under 31-D (b). Education—Special, the provision for one temporary teacher, Students' Hostel, of Rs. 1,500 be omitted (Budget page 134).*

In moving the motion he said :—" I request the Government for information as to the hostel to which this teacher is attached. If it is only for a particular hostel, may I request the Government to extend this help to other hostels? If the Government assures me, I have no objection to withdraw my proposition."

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" The provision of Rs. 1,500 for one temporary teacher, at the Students' Hostel, is to coach students of all communities who are deficient in the English language just as we do in the Vizagapatam High School. The provision is not meant for any particular community, and at present the temporary teacher teaches nine Brahmans, eight non-Brahmans and one Indian Christian girl student."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The following motions were not then moved and were therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

28. *That under 31-D (b). Education—Special, the provision for one temporary teacher, Students' Hostel, of Rs. 1,500 be omitted (Budget page 134).*

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

29. *That under 31-D (b). Education—Special, the provision of Rs. 1,500 for temporary teacher, Students' Hostel, be omitted (Budget page 134).*

Mr. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR moved :—

30. *That under 31-D. Education—Special, the provision for remuneration to the lady doctor of Rs. 600 be omitted (Budget page 134).*

In doing so, he said :—" May I request the Government for information as to what the duties of the lady doctor are, whether medical inspection of any schools or medical attendance at a particular hostel? If it is the latter, may I request the Government to extend this general help to all other hostels, non-Brahman Hindu and Christian hostels?"

[The Hon'ble Mr. A. Subbarayulu Reddiyar] [26th March 1921]

The Hon'ble Diwan Bahadur A. SUBBARAYULU REDDIYAR :—" The lady doctor referred to has to serve at the Students' Home on the Marina and for that her salary will be Rs. 600 per annum. But her services cannot be extended, as there will be enough of patients at the Students' Home on whom she has to attend. They are the patients that will be looked after by the lady doctor. As regards the medical service required in other hostels certainly consideration will be bestowed on the engagement of another doctor for that purpose."

The motion was then by leave withdrawn."

The following motions were not then moved and were therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

31. That under 31-D (b). Education—Special, the provision for remuneration to the lady doctor of Rs. 600 be omitted (Budget page 134).

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

32. That under 31-D (b). Education—Special, the provision of Rs. 600 for a lady doctor be omitted (Budget page 134).

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—

33. That the following items of duty allowance be omitted—31-D (b). Education—Special—Training Schools for Mistresses—

		Rs.
Duty allowance of women clerks (Budget page 135).	...	300
Do. teachers (Budget page 135)	...	12,732

Mr. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—

34. (3) 31-D (b). Education—Special—

To women clerks (Budget page 135) ... .. Omit Rs. 300

To women teachers (Budget page 135) ... .. " 12,732

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

35. That the following alterations be made in 31-D (b). Education—Special—transferred :—

Delete Rs. 12,732, duty allowance of women teachers (Budget page 135).

The following motion which stood in the name of Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu was owing to the absence of the Honourable Member deemed to have been withdrawn :—

36. That the demands for Rs. 21,000 and Rs. 9,800 for ' formation of a Provincial Educational Service for Women ' and ' additional posts of Indian Educational Service for Women ' under 31-D (b) be reduced to one rupee in each case (Budget page 135).

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR moved :—

37. Delete Rs. 9,800 for additional posts of Indian Educational Service for Women (Budget page 135).

In doing so, he said :—" Mr. President, women's education in this country is in a very bad state. All the same we are just having a small number and a growing number of Indian ladies taking to higher education. We have got the first few batches. It is a complaint that these ladies who have qualified themselves do not receive the sort of encouraging help they are entitled to. Hitherto there has been no provincial service for these women employees in the Education



26th March 1921]

[M. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar]

Department. For the first time I find provision is made for the formation of a Provincial Education Service for Women in this year's budget. A new provision for an appointment in Indian Educational Service is made under training schools for mistresses. I do not see any necessity at all for importing women from other countries to Indian Educational Service above the head of local ladies who are trained here. Among them there are several talents available and there are also several L.T.'s in service. It is a great pity that the claims of these people are to be overlooked and other people, probably with lower qualifications, have to be brought from other countries. I requested the Education Minister to give me information about women employees in the Education Department and their qualification and the time they were appointed and their pay. I hoped this information would be available for me before this question was taken up for discussion. Unfortunately I have not been able to get the information yet. So I have to speak from what information I have. I assure the House that the complaint is very loud and I think it is a very serious one, that local talent in the form of lady graduates and lady L.T.'s do not receive that sort of encouragement to which they are entitled and some people as I said who are no better qualified and who in many cases are worse qualified are put over their heads. If this is to continue the advancement in the education of women for which we are all pleading is bound to suffer. And therefore we are bound to support local talent in this matter. If we are to import women from outside, I think, women's education in this country will receive a set back. It is, therefore, Sir, that I propose that this provision be deleted. I should have no objection to add the appointment to the Provincial Service."

2-30 p.m. Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"Mr. President, I rise to oppose this motion. The Honourable Member recognizes the necessity for improving the staff which has the control of women's education. There is no question that girls' education has been far too much neglected in the past and that sufficient attention has not been bestowed on girls' education as has been done on the education of boys, and I think this House will generally agree with me that the time has come when a special spurt should be put on for the education of women in general. Sir, if that point is conceded, I think the Honourable Member will also realize that the superior posts of the Indian Educational Service are absolutely necessary for the giving of higher education for girls. I am sorry that the Honourable Member has brought in the question of race again into this matter. It is not a hard and fast rule that these posts of Indian Educational Service should be filled in by imported ladies. There is no such rule at all, and I can assure him that local talent will be as much recognized as imported talent. If that assurance will have any effect, I hope the Honourable Member will not press this resolution."

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"Sir, if it is not intended that these appointments are for women recruited from England, I shall have no objection to withdraw."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The following motions which stood respectively in the names of Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai and Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar were not moved by them and were deemed to have been withdrawn:—

38. That the grant of Rs. 4,57,000 in 31-D (b). Education--Special--Training Schools for Mistresses be reduced by a sum of Rs. 2,10,000 (Budget page 123).

39. That under 31-D (b) (iv). Education--Special the provision of Rs. 3,000 for a Superintendent of Sanskrit Schools be omitted (Budget page 136),

[Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar] [26th March 1921]

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—"Sir, the resolution I am to move is—

'40. That under 31-D (b) (iv). Education--Special the provision of Rs. 3,000 for a Superintendent of Sanskrit Schools be omitted (Budget page 136).'

"I have not heard from the Government how many schools there are which have to be superintended with this grant that is being made. If it is only for one school which is located in a very wealthy locality, I think I must object to this on the ground that the money might be more usefully employed for other educational purposes."

The Hon'ble Diwan Bahadur A. SUBBARAYULU REDDIYAR :—"The number of schools is 269, scattered throughout the whole Presidency."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The following motions, No. 41 standing in the name of Mr. M. C. Raja and Nos. 42 and 43 standing in the name of Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar, were not moved by them and were therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

41. That under 31-D (b) (iv). Education--Special the provision of Rupees 3,000 for a Superintendent of Sanskrit Schools be omitted (Budget page 136).

42. Delete Rs. 3,000, salary of Superintendent of Sanskrit Schools (Budget page 136).

43. Delete Rs. 840 and Rs. 2,600 provided for the establishment and travelling allowance of Superintendent of Sanskrit Schools (Budget page 136).

Mr. P. SIVA RAO.—"Sir, the amendment that I propose to move is—

'44. That under the Detailed Account No. 31-E (b) (ii) the provision of Rupees 1,40,160 for the supervisors of elementary schools may be omitted (Budget page 139).'

"Now, Sir, the expenditure upon the head of inspection has grown enormously during the last five years and if I may be allowed to refer to the budget account of the several years, the expenditure under the head of 'Inspection' in 1916-17 was about Rs. 8,47,000, in 1917-1918 it was Rs. 8,71,000, in 1919, 9 lakhs, in 1920 Rs. 9,39,000 and in the revised estimate for the current year 1920-21 the expenditure allotted is about 11 lakhs and in the present budget, the budget for the coming year, the provision made comes to about Rs. 13,57,000. So, I may take it that during the last five years the expenditure under the head of 'Inspection' has grown up by about 60 per cent. Now, Sir, it may be stated on the other side by the Government that if the expenditure under the head of 'Inspection' has grown by 60 per cent, the expenditure under the general head of 'Education' also has kept pace with the same and has grown also. I am quite alive to the fact, Sir, that under the head of 'General Education' from 83 lakhs in the year 1916-17 the total expenditure has grown to about 156 lakhs. If all these expenditure had gone towards the formation of new schools, that might be some excuse for the augmenting or strengthening the head of 'Inspection'; but I am not at all sure that all this expenditure of 156 lakhs to which it has grown during the last five years has been entirely devoted towards the multiplication of schools in our Presidency. Leaving that apart, it may be stated that out of the total expenditure under the head of 'Education' provided in the next year, which is 156 lakhs, the amount provided under the head of 'Inspection' for the coming year is 13 lakhs which comes to about 8½ per cent.

"Now, Sir, the memorandum prepared by the Honourable the Finance Member explains the object which the Government have in view with regard to this inspection grant. It is stated at page 10 of that memorandum: 'As regards



26th March 1921]

[Mr. P. Siva Rao]

controlling staff, the object which the Government have in view is the appointment of one inspector for each district except the Nilgiris with one sub-assistant inspector for each taluk. This means a total number of 25 officers in the first class excluding the inspector of European schools and of 226 in the second; it has been impossible, however, to make the full provision that was desired in this respect in the year 1921-22, and the total number provided for is 19 inspectors and 211 sub-assistant inspectors'. So I may take it, Sir, that the present policy has been to provide for one inspector of schools for each district and one sub-assistant inspector of schools for each taluk. I find ample provision made in the budget for the purpose. We have got provision made for 171 permanent sub-assistant inspectors and 35 temporary, in all 206, and if we may calculate it roughly, it comes to one sub-assistant inspector for every taluk; and we have got a number of inspectors of schools also, 13 permanent inspectors with 3 temporary added, three inspectresses of girls schools with three temporary added, that is the provision made for the inspectors and inspectresses of schools—and in all, Sir, we have got 206 sub-assistant inspectors of schools with temporary also included. In consideration of this, one wonders why, when there is ample provision made for the appointment of sub-assistant inspectors for each taluk, about 206 in number, this class of supervisors which has been in existence for a long time should continue to exist. I have been told several times in the Finance Committee that the Government was only waiting for the final sanction of the Secretary of State and that as soon as this sanction was obtained for the extra number of the sub-assistant inspectors we were told that this class of officers would cease altogether to exist. Now, I would ask when there is one sub-assistant inspector of schools for every taluk, is there any real necessity for the supervisors at all? The total number of supervisors that has been provided for in the coming budget comes to about 224 and now we shall see how many schools on an average a taluk has,—I mean schools under public management or aided. On an average, it will have about 100 to 120 or 125 schools and the question seriously arises for consideration whether the sub-assistant inspector of schools in each taluk cannot be trusted with the supervision of 125 schools in his taluk. In other words, Sir, it comes to this, whether in the course of a year a sub-assistant inspector in charge of a taluk cannot be expected to inspect and supervise the school work that is done in about 120 or 125 schools in his own taluk. After all, Sir, I would again ask, is there any use in going on multiplying this supervising staff when we have not got enough money for strengthening the schools. A full supervising staff presupposes a fully equipped school. Is there any use providing for supervisors, sub-assistant inspectors, assistant inspectors, and inspectors of schools, when the schools themselves are in a highly deficient condition, when the schools are undermanned, when they are ill-equipped, and when the teachers themselves are grossly underpaid. Now, Sir, the time is come, I should say, that this class of supervisors at least should cease. They have become a costly redundancy, and I think the Government will see their way to put an end to these officers wholly; if I remember right, in the discussion that was going on in the Finance Committee, the policy enunciated was that, as soon as this class of sub-assistant inspectors of schools was formed, there will be no need for these supervisors. With these few words, I move for the deletion of the provision for 224 supervisors in the budget.

"I may observe, lastly, that in addition to these inspecting officers, we have got the presidents of the taluk boards, the presidents of district boards, vice-presidents of taluk boards and vice presidents of district boards, who are expected to super-

[Mr. P. Siva Rao]

[26th March 1921]

wise the work that goes on in these elementary schools, and now, Sir, that the Educational Councils are in view, it may be that the District Educational Councils will have to employ their own supervisors. In any view, there won't be any necessity for perpetuating this class of numerous supervisors like 224 in the budget."

MR. R. G. GRIEVE :—" Mr. President, Mr. Siva Rao really himself in his last sentence has answered his own motion by saying that it was quite probable that the District Educational Councils might require a staff of supervisors. Apart from that, I quite agree that ultimately as an ideal we hope to work up to two classes of inspecting officers only, the Inspector of Schools or the Sub-Assistant or Deputy Inspector, whatever you like to call him; but you cannot abolish the supervisors immediately. We have to remember that education is continually expanding. The Honourable Member says that the average number of schools in a taluk is 120 or 125, and he imagines that a sub-assistant can very well look after that number. I should like to point out that there are many taluks in this Presidency where the number of schools is not 120 or so, but is about 300. The proposals that I submitted to the Government some time ago for the strengthening of the inspecting staff were to enable us to reach an average, not of about 120 or 125 as Mr. Siva Rao put it but of 150 schools. We hope to reach that standard. We recognise that we may have to go further eventually, but till you can get an adequate number of sub-assistant inspectors and give them sufficient salary and till you can make it possible for them to know their whole charge intimately, you cannot abolish the supervisors' agency as well. As I have said elsewhere these sub-assistant inspectors are a very heavily worked class of officers. They have a very hard life of constant travelling and with the best will in the world they cannot inspect their schools more than once or twice in the year. I submit that for elementary schools that is not adequate supervision and their work has to be supplemented by the class of supervisors. I submit, therefore, that you must keep this provision in for some years to come. Ultimately, we may be able to absorb these supervisors in other cadres, or they could be retired, but at present it is not right to do so."

MR. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" Mr. President, Sir, I beg to oppose this reduction and I will give only a few grounds for doing so.

12-45 p.m.

First of all, it is not advisable to reduce any sum, however small it may be, given for education. Our object should be to increase the votes that are to be made in favour of the departments in charge of the Ministers and to see that no objection is taken next year to their asking for additional demands. So far as the elementary schools are concerned, our cry has always been that we want more sums and larger grants to promote elementary education throughout the country and it will, therefore, be a very bad policy to reduce any sum, however small it may be, provided for elementary education. So far as these schools are concerned, we heard the Hon'ble Mr. Siva Rao saying that supervisors are necessary for them if they are well-equipped. My own impression is that there will be a time when all these supervisors may be abolished entirely if all the schools become well equipped; because there will then be no necessity for any supervision or advice being given by these supervisors. In fact what takes place now is that many of these schoolmasters, a large number of whom are not trained, and who get a small pittance either from the taluk board or the district board or the municipality, or from private patrons, are generally people who have recourse to other means of income and teaching in the school is only one of their



26th March 1921] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

professions. If there is no fear in the minds of these people that there will be recurring inspections by higher officers, these people are not likely to devote as much attention to these schools as it is absolutely necessary. On the average we have got only one sub-assistant inspector and one supervisor for each taluk. Granting that we have got about 150 and not 300 schools, only two days can be devoted by every officer for one inspection in a year. We cannot expect these travelling officers to devote more than two days to a school if the inspection is to be on a satisfactory basis. One inspection by the sub-assistant inspector and another by the supervisor in a year over each of these mostly ill-equipped schools, where the teachers are not trained and where the villagers are craving for some small education, will be very useful. I know in several cases these officers are not only examining persons but they are also advising them. In schools where these teachers are not trained men, the supervisors teach them how to teach and how to manage the institutions. On these grounds, Sir, I am strongly against any reduction of any item under Education and especially in the matter of supervision of elementary education."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"I feel it my duty so far as this motion before the House is concerned to say that the supervisors are not doing the work for which they are primarily intended. The Inspection Code, which I have in my hands, says that the supervisor's duties will be of a pioneering nature. He will form the connecting link between the department on the one hand and the villagers on the other and start and organise village schools."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"May I know, Sir, what edition of the Code the Honourable Member is referring to? There are several editions of it."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"This is the edition of 1912. May I know if it has been modified?"

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I believe 1912 is the last complete edition. But I understand a large number of corrigenda have been issued to that edition."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"I am not concerned with the number of editions. I only wish to know if the proceedings of the Director of Public Instruction of 1909 on which I rely have been modified or cancelled."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I must apologise for rising on my feet again. I understand that the information given by me is not quite accurate. The last edition is that of 1916."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"I repeat that I am not concerned with the number of editions. I only want to know if the proceedings of the Director of Public Instruction of 1909 on which I rely have been modified or cancelled or revised. I take it that the proceedings on which I rely continue to have force."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"The Honourable Member first began by reading from an obsolete edition of the Code."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—"I think the best thing will be to allow the Honourable Member to finish his speech and then for the Government to correct him if there is any mistake."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"Then, Sir, I am obliged to say that the supervisors are not doing the work for which they are appointed. If we take the statistics issued by the department year after year we find that in the year

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

[26th March 1921]

1917-18 there were elementary schools to the number of 3,902. In 1918-19 they fell down to 3,670. In 1920 there is a still further fall to 3,435 while in the strength of the supervisors there has been no fall. While in the number of schools there is a reduction of 25 per cent we do not find any such large variation in the strength of the supervisors. If the supervisor is a pioneer who has to organise schools, the test will be found in the number of the private aided schools, newly started year after year. It is obvious that the supervisor has not been able to add to the list of private schools to any appreciable number but there has been a fall in the number of schools. So, there is something wrong with these officers. The system should either be mended or ended. I think that till it is mended it had better end at least, temporarily instead of money being wasted year after year."

Mr. K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—"Mr. President, Sir, probably my remarks may appear to be directed towards the depletion of this grant; but I am not prepared to support the motion of Mr. Siva Rao entirely which is for the depletion of expenditure under this head. My experience of these supervisors is not probably that of the Director of Public Instruction. But as president of a taluk board, I have had occasions to examine this question rather very considerably. While coming to the conclusion that the supervision that is required with regard to the elementary and aided schools will have to be continued, I have also to say that the manner in which this supervision is conducted is not very satisfactory. I know some supervisors personally who have been turning out very satisfactory work; but in a majority of cases, I am sorry to remark, their work is not efficient. On that ground alone I find it impossible to support this motion. It is impossible no doubt that we can do away with the whole staff at present; but I should like to know from the Government whether under the new circumstances under which these elementary schools are going to be conducted by the various district councils, Government are not going to adopt a new policy of gradually withdrawing these grants and applying them towards strengthening the hands of the various District Councils in the matter of supervision. As I found it impossible to effect a thorough supervision among the various board schools under my taluk board, I was put to the necessity of appointing some advisory village committees in order to assist me in the matter of supervision; I found in several cases the village schoolmasters dodging their work. In several cases, I may bring this fact to the notice of the Director of Public Instruction; these aided schoolmasters do not regularly keep the schools. Only at the time of inspection either by the supervisor, or the sub-assistant inspector or the inspector or the Director of Public Instruction for the matter of that, they keep the schools open in order to draw the grants. These facts are rather very painful to us. We must see that these matters are mended, but not ended as Mr. Siva Rao's motion appears to suggest. I wish to know from the Government whether, under the new circumstances, they are not going to change their policy with regard to the supervision through this agency. I am in favour of liberal grants being given through district agencies. On these grounds, I am not in favour of this motion."

Rao Bahadur K. S. VENKATARAMA AYYAR :—"Mr. President, Sir, I beg to support the motion that is now before the House. It is true that these supervisors go and inspect the schools. But my own idea is that Government are not getting any return for the expenditure, that is being incurred on the salary of these supervisors of elementary schools. Now the provision made is Rs. 1,40,160, and we find at page 132 of the budget that the provision for building grants to primary



26th March 1921]

[Mr. K. S. Venkatarama Ayyar]

schools is only Rs. 71,000 and the provision for contributions to local bodies for the construction of elementary school buildings is nil. I should like that this sum under consideration should be paid towards the cost of primary school buildings, for aided schools and towards the contribution to local bodies, or it may be utilized for the purpose of giving a solid grant for the education of depressed classes. These supervisors can very well be dispensed with, as I find there is too much of inspection. This reminds me of some of the chatrams endowed by the Raja of Tanjore and supervised by the district board; we find in each chatram a clerk, an amin, a servant and so on, and, after all, the people fed there are only two or three. We must first of all increase the number of institutions, no matter whether they are good or bad, and allow them for some time to be mended by local opinion. Especially in the face of the fact that district councils are going to come into force, which will take the trouble of setting right these institutions, it is better that we have not got too much of inspection and too much of destructive criticism without any constructive criticism. I, therefore, think that these supervisors of elementary schools should be abolished and their services utilized in being drafted into the regular Government service and the service of local bodies. I do not say that they should be disbanded and sent home all at once. They can very well be taken into the existing institutions rather than asking them to go about inspecting the schools. There is no virtue in these people saying that they have been inspecting so many schools. I suggest that the sub-assistant inspector should stay in each school or in each village for two or three days, speaking to the people on educational matters and devising means how best to improve the condition of education in that locality."

MR. A. T. PALMER :—"I had the fortune to stumble into some of the elementary schools in different periods of my life and I had a memorable experience. In one of the schools I remember the headmaster was absent and the teachers were chatting over a *pan supari* business and the boys were playing hide and seek. I thought it was a happy school, but it needed supervision. I believe the more supervisors we have the better for such schools."

RAO BAHADUR T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—"I also oppose the motion. We are going to increase the number of elementary schools, and therefore supervisors also should be increased. There is no meaning in our saying that the District Committees are going to supervise the elementary schools. One may as well consent to the curtailment of the superior staff, but the subordinate staff is necessary, because the schools are scattered all over the country. I do not think the Taluk Board Presidents are careful to inspect these schools. There ought to be a staff of supervisors, and it will have to be increased as we increase the number of elementary schools."

MR. G. VANDANAM :—"The supervisors are expected not only to supervise these schools but also to give model lessons. In my place the supervisors are doing very good work in going to schools and suggesting new methods of teaching and also giving model lessons. If we abolish such officers much of the needed service will be left undone. There are some schools where the teachers themselves are the managers of the schools and there are nobody to look after their work. If left to himself the teacher-manager does not go to the village where his school is, comes to the school just at the time of inspection to collect the boys and present them before the Inspector. There must be supervision to such schools."

RAO BAHADUR A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"I am glad that this motion has been brought before this Council as it has given an opportunity to discuss about the

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu]

[26th March 1921]

present system of inspection and as it has enabled us to find a means of working out a better system of inspection. There will not be anyone here who would say that there ought not to be a proper agency to supervise the various elementary and other kinds of schools. But the point for consideration is whether the present method is suitable. There is likely to be under the present system a certain amount of overlapping or duplicating of the work. Is that the right sort of thing to be continued. We find a provision made not merely for the maintenance of the existing supervisors of schools, but there is also provision made for additional inspectors and sub-assistant inspectors of schools. It will be noticed that there will be overlapping of functions both of the inspectors and the assistant inspectors and again of sub-assistant inspectors and supervisors to a great extent. It has been the policy of the Government for a long time, and I don't find any justification for putting it off any longer that this duplication of work should be done away with. We might have one inspecting agency for high schools, i.e., the inspectors and another agency, i.e., deputy inspectors for other schools. I don't find any justification for continuing this old complicated machinery in this department—inspectors, assistant-inspectors, sub-assistant inspectors, supervisors, etc. Those who have experience of the supervision of the elementary schools throughout the presidency will be satisfied that as between the supervisors and the sub-assistant inspectors, there has been unnecessary waste of trouble and time in one going over the same area as the other, they probably not being in a position to divide their work. Now that the question of supervisors has been raised, the Hon'ble the Director of Public Instruction has told us that in course of time the supervisors would be done away with. I urge that it is already late and the earlier they are done away with the better. The present system is very unsatisfactory. We must improve the system and provide for effective supervision. But I must admit that there is unnecessary duplicating of machinery which must be done away with as early as possible."

Mr. R. G. GRIEVE:—"I just want to make one or two remarks with reference to what the Honourable Members have said on this motion. I am sorry I was not able to find what Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar referred to. By comparison of the various codes, however, I have found the extract relating to the functions of the supervisors. The point is emphasized in the paragraph quoted by the Honourable Member that the superior inspecting officers may transfer to the senior supervisor in the range a number of schools within the jurisdiction of the latter, and, in special cases where it is necessary, entrust the annual inspection of the school to supervisors. Mr. K. S. Venkatarama Ayyar said that he considered it proper for the sub-assistant inspector to spend in a school three or four days. I should like to point out if that ideal was reached we should require not 42 additional sub-assistant inspectors but perhaps a thousand more. As regards the remarks of Mr. Vandanam, I agree with him that one of the things that we have to watch is the working of the elementary schools when the inspecting authorities are not in the locality. I submit that if you reduce the number of inspecting officers you are making it easier for the teacher to be irregular. As regards the remarks of Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao about overlapping I do not admit their accuracy altogether. I repeat that ultimately we hope to have two classes of inspecting officers—the inspector and the deputy inspector. But that is an ideal for the future, and it will not be wise in the interest of elementary education to abolish the supervisors at present."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"I have no hesitation in opposing this resolution. As a matter of fact, the inspection of elementary



26th March 1921] [Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu]

schools is very perfunctory at present. It is the common practice to suppose that the supervisor should inspect the schools twice a year and the sub-assistant inspector once. This is what the rules lay, and this is the state of things at present. If my honourable friend's proposal is carried out and 224 supervisors are abolished, it seems to me that the inspection of the elementary schools must inevitably suffer. At one time, I was under the impression that there was a comprehensive scheme for the abolition of supervisors of elementary schools and for expanding the cadre of sub-assistant inspectors of schools, so as to absorb the present number of inspecting officers. I do not know what became of that. It had been held over for want of funds. The idea is to replace these supervisors by deputy inspectors. If under the existing circumstances we are to be deprived of the services of supervisors of schools, it will be a step in the wrong direction. We have also this additional fact that there is a point of view whether the inspecting agency should be brought under the District Educational Council or whether it is to continue under the department. This matter was discussed recently. But undoubtedly this is not the time to take up this step. For the present I do not think that we should be doing a right thing in abolishing the supervisors."

The Rev. E. M. MACPHAIL :—"Mr. President, I oppose this motion as I consider the supervision of schools as of very great importance. I have intervened in the debate simply because I wish to say that I hope that Government, in view of the position they have taken up to-day and the importance they attach to the supervision of schools, will see their way to make suitable grants for supervision to the managers of aided schools. Of late, Government have been declining to give such grants, but I hope that after this debate they will, in view of the importance they attach to supervision, give grants for supervisors to aided schools."

Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu moved for the closure of the debate. The closure motion was put and agreed to.

The motion was then put to vote and lost.

The following motion standing in the name of Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu was not moved and was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

! '45. *That in the demand under 31-E (b) (ii) Education—General—Inspection, the grant of Rs. 9,500 proposed for temporary establishment be omitted.*

1-15 p.m.

Rao Bahadur K. S. VENKATARAMA AYYAR :—"I beg to move the motion which stands in my name as follows :—

'46. *That the sum of Rs. 2,36,500 provided for travelling allowance on page 140 be reduced to Rs. 1,00,000—No. 31-E.*

"My reason in moving this motion is this: I was able to follow the remarks of the Hon'ble the Director of Public Instruction when he said that if each sub-assistant inspector were to spend three or four days in inspecting each school, he would not be able to do the work satisfactorily and inspection would not be complete. I do admit that. But it proceeds on the assumption that he will have to inspect completely all the schools at least once a year. I submit that it is unnecessary that the schools should be inspected once a year. There are so many agencies which could look after the business. If the inspection is made thoroughly by staying three or four days in each village and making the village people understand the value of education and co-operation with the Educational authorities in the matter of education in these rural areas, I think a great deal can be done by these inspectors than by merely going and inspecting the school and passing remarks as to whether the school has been maintaining all benches or the number of planks which would be necessary to maintain the school is sufficient. My idea

[Mr. K. S. Venkatarama Ayyar]

[26th March 1921]

is that the travelling should be done not merely for the purpose of getting travelling allowances or showing that a large number of schools has been inspected. He will not have the necessary time to stay in the place for doing any useful work. He goes to a place in the morning. He has time only to look after his comforts and inspect the place. Then, again, he leaves it either that evening or the next morning if the travelling is restricted to a certain place. I think there must be sufficient time for him to get in touch with the people of the village and he can do much useful work. The amount of Rs. 2 lakhs and odd provided for travelling allowance is not quite necessary. Of course, I am aware that recently the scale of travelling allowance is increased, and therefore increased provision should be made. I think the inspection should proceed on different lines and on the lines which I have submitted for the consideration of this House."

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—"The travelling allowance provided for under this head is for all grades of inspecting officers, and as the Honourable Member has himself pointed out in the course of his speech that the rate of travelling allowance has been increased, the additional amount, if placed at our disposal under this item in the budget, will not be just sufficient. As regards the general question whether inspection should be less frequent (which is practically what the Honourable Member's suggestion comes to), that is to say, that a school should be inspected once in three or four years, I leave it to the general sense of the House to decide whether it is a feasible suggestion at all. It is possible that if this suggestion is accepted, we may have to enormously increase the cadre of inspecting officers. Then, again, comes the question of finance. Further, to say that it is sufficient that the inspecting officers inspect the schools once in three or four years is an impracticable suggestion."

Rao Bahadur K. S. VENKATARAMA AYYAR :—"I have left the suggestion to the consideration of the Director of Public Instruction and, therefore, I do not press the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"The motion which stands in my name runs as follows :—

*'That the following alteration be made in 31-E (b) (i) 47 Education—General—Direction :—*

*Reduce Rs. 20,000 provided for appointment of an additional Inspectress and additional Inspectors by Rs. 5,000 (Budget, page 140).'*

"Sir, I take very strong exception to the provision made in the budget for inspection of schools in this Presidency. The Public Service Commission which quite recently went into the details of this question state that these inspectors are to be increased by a very small number, not more than one-third; they should be called chief inspectors and paid a higher salary than the inspectors, because there should be a distinction between the two. They also suggested that each district ought to have an inspector to look after the education in the district. They also stated that the assistant inspectors should cease to exist the moment the inspector is appointed for the district, and that the chief inspectors ought to be classed as class (1) and other inspectors are to be classed as class (2). The district inspectors ought to be classed as (2). They say that the scale of salary for the chief inspector should be from Rs. 550 to Rs. 1,250, Rs. 250 to Rs. 700 for other inspectors. They also state that the assistant inspectors,



26th March 1921]

[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar]

who were employed during the time, are all to be abolished as soon as the district inspectors are appointed. We find these recommendations are not at all followed and arrangements are proposed to the great detriment of the finances of this province. Last year there were seven inspectors in the Indian Educational Service and six in the Provincial Educational Service. The salary on which the former are to be started is Rs. 400, rising up to Rs. 1,750. That is the maximum that was fixed for these appointments. The Provincial Educational Service men are to be started on Rs. 250 and their salaries are to terminate at Rs. 800. The difference between the one and the other can easily be perceived. Now, instead of having seven people from the Indian Educational Service and six from the Provincial Educational Service, we have provided in the budget for 16 inspectors appointed from the Indian Educational Service on the higher scale from Rs. 400 to Rs. 1,750, which, with their travelling allowance, duty allowance, overseas allowance, etc., will probably come to a maximum of Rs. 2,000 or more. To make such a provision for the whole Presidency with a minimum pay of Rs. 2,000 for each district inspector is, I consider, something too extravagant for any Government; but still a provision like that has been made in the budget. And not only that, the assistant inspectors who are 13 in number at the time are not abolished as was recommended by the Public Service Commission. They are to continue further, and are, I suppose, to be placed on the Provincial Educational Service cadre. Now we have got 16 men in our Provincial Educational Service and we are going to get 16 men for the Indian Educational Service, and all these appointments are to be completed this year. I am objecting to this course not because that a certain man who is recruited to the Indian Educational Service belongs to a particular race. The question is not one of mere race at all. Only last week or so, a number of Indians got into the Imperial Service. The question is one purely of economy or expenditure, and not race at all. The Public Service Commission recommended that in the Educational department the Indian element should be increased. They stated that in the existing appointments, probably to begin with, 25 per cent ought to be given to Indians and this percentage ought to be gradually increased. It was not their intention that this scheme ought to be worked up by increasing the number of appointments. No doubt they thought, Sir, that in giving effect to the recommendations more appointments should be made, but it was not the idea of the Public Service Commission that it was by increasing the number of appointments that the Indians ought to be provided for. Now, what has happened is the number of appointments has been more than doubled, i.e., raised from 7 to 16, and then a few Indians are appointed to these posts. That is not the way in which the service was sought to be indianized.

“Now, by the arrangement proposed, the cost has become considerable, very extravagant, and also the assistant inspectors are not taken away. In addition to all this, we are now asked to sanction a provision for the addition of more inspectors and inspectresses. Now we have got three inspectresses. With regard to these inspectresses also, I have heard, Sir, there are some Indian ladies who have acted as inspectresses for a considerable period of time. I think one assistant inspectress acted for five or six years, and in spite of the fact that she was competent to hold the post, other ladies were got in and she has not found any chance of being made permanent, and when a permanent vacancy fell in, some other lady was brought in. Again, Sir, I heard within the last few months that another lady who has put in smaller service has superseded the claims of others who are as qualified or even better qualified.”

[Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar]

[26th March 1921]

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" May I know whom the Honourable Member is referring to ? "

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" I am referring in the first case to Mrs. Srinivasa, who was acting for a long time, and in the other to Miss Macleod, who has superseded Miss Lazarus. We find quite competent people who are able to do the work quite satisfactorily.

" I may also mention in this connexion one other point which I mentioned last week or week before last. For the purpose of inspection and for the purpose of doing district work, we are appointing these inspectors and inspectresses. They have to come in contact with the people of the district, and it is absolutely necessary that they must be people who know the customs of those with whom they are moving and be able to converse freely and influence their notions and ideals. If people who are strangers are appointed, they will not be able to do their work as satisfactorily and as efficiently as others who know their customs and manners and understand their feelings. And it is both from the point of view of efficiency and of economy, I submit that the provision made to give such huge salaries for inspectors and inspectresses is quite unjustifiable and out of all proportion to what we can bear. As I have already stated in another connexion, our country is a very poor country and it cannot afford to pay even the salaries that are paid in other countries. We are now paying in India not only such salaries as are paid in other countries, but even much higher salaries."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" I rise to a point of order, which I should have taken at the very outset. The resolution refers to additional inspectors as well as to additional inspectresses, but the item in the budget refers only to additional inspectors. My point is that 'additional inspectresses' should not come into the discussion at all. On page 140 of the budget we find the side heading 'Appointment of an additional inspectress of schools,' but the amount of Rs. 11,000 shown against it refers to the budget provision in the estimate for 1920-21 and the entry in the column for 1921-22 is blank."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—" Do I understand the Honourable Member to say that Rs. 20,000 attacked by Mr. Ramalingam Chettiyar refers only to additional inspectors ? "

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" That is my opinion. That is what the entries in the budget mean."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—" Will the Honourable Member Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar explain his position ? "

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" The major portion of my argument was directed only against inspectors."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—" Then the Honourable Member will confine himself to additional inspectors."

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR (*continuing*) :—" As I have submitted, without caring either for the recommendations of the Public Service Commission, or for efficiency or economy, and without also considering the circumstances under which we are living and our capacity to bear the expenditure, this expenditure on inspection has been so extravagantly increased and is now farther sought to be increased by this lump provision of Rs. 20,000, and I beg to submit, Sir, that this sum should not be allowed.

" What I want to press on the notice of the Council is that I want to make this reduction of Rs. 5,000 by making new appointments on the lower scale, and not on the scale provided for in the budget."



26th March 1921]

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"Sir, I am glad that the Honourable Member from Coimbatore has raised this important issue. I believe it is admitted on all hands that Indianization of education is absolutely essential in order that the national interests may be given greater importance. Very recently we have had an article in one of the leading journals of India on national education and supervising authorities. If we want that education should be modern, and developed on national lines, there is very strong reason in favour of Indianization of education. It is on this principle I beg leave to suggest that, as far as possible wherever opportunity occurs, Indian inspectors to offices and Indian Educational officers should have to be substituted, and their maintenance is essential on grounds of economy and efficiency. While I do not discredit the work that is being done by the European agency, I do believe and hold that better work can be done by the same offices being held by Indians. Comparing the cost of education in India and the cost of education in this Presidency within the last few years, we find that there is an enormous rise in the cost of expenditure, and it makes one feel where we shall stop. If we are to expand education—secondary, higher and elementary—and if we are to expend so much money on inspection and supervision only, where is the room for development all round? Therefore, it seems to me that it is necessary to draw the attention of the department to this important principle, viz., that, as far as possible, Indianization of officers should be adopted. It is for this purpose that I rise to speak on this matter."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I am sorry I have again to rise to a point of order. It is to enquire whether the whole trend of the last speaker's remarks is in order. He is perhaps not aware that there is no racial qualification for appointment to the post of inspectors. The question of the Indianization of the Inspectorate, therefore, does not arise on this motion. As a matter of fact, the House will probably be told later on what proportion Indian inspectors bear to the total existing staff. There is no need for any racial feelings in this matter, and I am intervening at this stage in order, if possible, to avoid side track the Council from any such issue."

Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO (*continuing*) :—"There is absolutely no suggestion of racial feeling in this question. I raise this question in the interests of my country, in the interest of economy, in the interest of efficiency and in the interest of national advancement and progress, because Indian inspectors will be able to enter into the feelings of their countrymen."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"May I rise again, Sir, to the point of order and ask you, Sir, to give a ruling?"

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—"The Honourable Member is supporting the motion for the reduction of Rs. 20,000 allotted under this head by a sum of Rs. 5,000. If he could show that by the substitution of Indian agency for European agency that reduction will be made practicable, he would be in order in raising this question. If, however, he could not show that that substitution could produce that result, then he will be wholly out of order. Now, I will give him an opportunity of showing how, by substituting Indian for European agency, he could save the amount of Rs. 5,000."

Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO (*continuing*) :—"There would be a saving from out of the increased salaries and overseas allowances, and it requires no considerable perception to see that I want to show that economy and saving could be effected."

[Mr. A. T. Palmer]

[26th March 1921]

Mr. A. T. PALMER :—“ Mr. President, Sir, I have great pleasure in supporting what Mr. A. P. Patro has stated. I do not want to say anything about European inspectors, but I have seen European inspectors and I have seen Indian inspectors also.”

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ I am sorry, Sir, that I have to rise once more to the same point of order, namely, as regards the irrelevance of the question of Indian *versus* European. This speaker also is embarking on that issue.”

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—“ His reference to the question of European *versus* Indian would be relevant only if he could show that this saving of Rupees 5,000 could be brought about by the substitution. If he could show that, he would be perfectly in order. So he had better go to that point at once.”

Mr. A. T. PALMER (*continuing*) :—“ Thank you very much, Sir. It is this very point I was about to refer to. I was going to show that if we employ Indian inspectors there would be a saving. It does not require much to say that, because we would be paying less in the matter of allowances, overseas allowances, etc. There is no doubt there is greater discipline by appointment of European inspectors. But there is more sympathy, more fellow-feeling and more Indianization, if I may use that word, in employing Indian inspectors.”

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“ Mr. President, Sir, I beg shortly to oppose this resolution on the main ground that this was a policy adopted by the Public Services Commission itself to which the mover referred and which has been approved by the Secretary of State. I believe that Mr. Ramalinga Chetti has overlooked some of the essential paragraphs of the Public Services Commission Report. If he had read paragraph 5 to Annexure IV to the report, he would have seen that the present policy of having an inspector in the Indian Education Service for each division is the very policy which had been advocated by the Public Services Commission itself. With the permission of the House, I beg to read a few sentences from that Report. This is what the Public Services Commission Report says,—

‘ Starting from this basis, and excluding from consideration the subordinate service, we are satisfied by the evidence which we received from all quarters that there are in fact two kinds of work—one superior and one inferior—to be performed by educational officers, both on the administrative and collegiate side. On the administrative side this is particularly clear. Here the superior work is that of general supervision and control and the inferior that of ordinary inspection or teaching. For the former a highly and for the latter a less highly qualified type of officer is necessary. We recommend that this difference of fact be recognized and that the administrative service be divided into an upper and a lower class to give effect to this decision . . . Speaking generally, and to indicate what we have in mind, we would place in class (1) the Principals, and in most cases the Vice-Principals of the training colleges, the headmasters of the specially important high schools and the present inspectors of divisions, but we would call the last-named chief inspectors so as to emphasize the importance of their position.’

“ The report further says : ‘ We would also take the opportunity of the reorganization to abolish the present class of additional inspectors and to create new chief inspectorships in their place, until ultimately there shall be at least one chief inspector to each revenue division.’

“ This is in fact, Sir, the very policy which the Hon'ble the Finance Member has indicated in his memorandum of having one chief inspector, an Indian



26th March 1921] [Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar]

Educational Service officer, for each revenue division. It is according to that policy provision has been made in the present year's budget for three inspectors for an amount aggregating to Rs. 20,000. We are still very short of the required number, and as each inspector of the Indian Education Service is appointed, the assistant inspector will disappear. That is the policy which has been adopted by the Government. At present there are 16 inspectors and the present provision provides only for three more inspectors, that is to say, it brings the total number to 19 inspectors of the Indian Educational Service. I only wish very briefly to refer to the remarks of Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. At present, among the inspecting staff in the cadre of the Indian Educational Service as a whole we have nearly 50 per cent officers among the statutory Indians and the Honourable Members will have seen from the Gazette notification that very recently 13 Indian gentlemen have been promoted to the Indian Educational Service. It has been the policy of the Government, under orders from the Secretary of State, to see as far as possible that 50 per cent of the appointments in the Indian Educational Service are occupied by Indian gentlemen."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO Pantulu :—"Sir, I rise to support this motion. The portion to which the Hon'ble Mr. Ramaswami Mudaliyar has drawn our attention requires some consideration. We are glad that, under orders from the Government of India and the Secretary of State, Indians have been promoted to the Indian Educational Service. But the point which has been raised by the honourable mover of this resolution is on grounds of economy, regarding which this Council has been very particular from its inception. It suggests that by reducing the provision made in the budget under that head it will be possible to secure persons at a cost much less than what has been provided for in the budget. A reference to the recommendations of the Public Services Commission must make us pause a while before we accept them. If we have to-day to regret the heavy cost of administration in the various departments, it is unfortunately due to the recommendations of the Public Services Commission. It is not to-day in the year of grace 1921 that we are raising this protest, but it was raised even after the recommendations were published and widely circulated. My Hon'ble friend Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar may rest assured that my observations would be perfectly in order irrespective of the details which he is going to refer to. I am going to tell this House that merely because the Public Services Commission recommended a certain course of action, we should not accept it. We must view with considerable regret the increase in cost of expenditure which has been brought about by the recommendations of the Public Services Commission in various respects. If this House is satisfied about that, it cannot and ought not to take a different view even with reference to their recommendations in this matter. It is that aspect which I wish to place before this Council. Though this question has arisen upon a budget provision of Rs. 20,000 being the provision made for Assistant Inspectors it raises a very important question of principle. Though it may not be possible for us to criticize and condemn the proposals made by the Commission, this Council should when it has the opportunity of expressing its disapproval with some of the financial provisions, avail itself of such opportunity by supporting the motion of Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar. With these few words I support the motion of Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar."

Rev. E. M. MACPHAIL :—"Mr. President, it is difficult to say what one may or may not say on this matter. But I do feel myself that it is quite possible to draw a distinction between the men who are already in service and the men

[Rev. E. M. Macphail]

[26th March 1921]

who have to be recruited. If this distinction is considered, it seems to me that it is not possible to cut down the expenditure. It cannot be cut down by reducing the salaries of two or three officers who are going to be appointed. I feel myself that of recent years there is a feeling that the salaries of some officers should be cut down because men can be had for less and it is a question of supply and demand. You can, no doubt, get heaps of people who would be happy to be appointed as Inspectors of Schools on salaries much lower than those that are now paid, and I know there are a very large number of people who would be happy to become Inspectors to-morrow, but are we sure that they are well qualified to carry on the work of Inspectors? What I consider to be very important is that the man who inspects schools should have large experience. I am not going to enter into the question of European *versus* Indian, and I do not care whether an Inspector is a European or an Indian. But what I do think to be very important is that he should know something of education outside India. Of course, the Honourable Member from Ganjam spoke of nationalizing Indian education. I should like to find out from him exactly what that means. If nationalizing Indian education means to know what is being done in other countries in connexion with education and follow them, then we may begin nationalizing education in that way. I do not want to suggest that we should blindly copy what is followed in the West. But I do think that in trying to improve our schools we should try to know what has been done by other people in other countries, such as Great Britain, America and those on the continent of Europe. Personally, what I want to say is that every Inspector, whether Indian or European, should have a knowledge of educational progress in America and other places and what is done there in such matters, and then deal sympathetically and intelligently with the problems of this country. It is no doubt an excellent thing to talk of Indianization, but if the man feels himself to be no better than a pupil, he cannot make any impression and will not be useful. What is really wanted is that he should have a high ideal and if we can get men with high ideals then, I say they are worth the money we pay them."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"I just want to say a few words since the racial question has been introduced. No attempt has been made to show as to how the figure Rs. 5,000 has been arrived at. There are already 16 Inspectors, 13 permanent and 3 temporary, and 3 Inspectresses for Girls' Schools and if we take all the three sets together that makes 19. I understood Mr. Ramaswami Mudaliyar to say that there were going to be three additional Inspectors or 22 in all. Then apart from the old ancient history of this Royal Commission and other things, it has been stated that 50 per cent should be Indians according to the Secretary of State's orders. So that out of 22, 11 should be Indians. The fourth entry on page 139 gives overseas allowances to 11 people already. That means that there are already 11 Europeans out of the existing 19 and there are only 8 Indians. If the 50 per cent rule is to be enforced there will be no difficulty for the Government to say 'We will adopt the 50 per cent. These additional Inspectors will be Indians.' The three temporary Inspectors on page 139 seem to cost Rs. 14,400. I suppose all temporary officers are placed on a lower scale. If that is so, it is difficult to understand why the new Inspectors should cost Rs. 20,000.

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"May I with your permission, Sir, inform the Honourable Member that the provision of Rs. 20,000 includes establishment charges, travelling allowances and various other items—not merely the pay of the Inspectors themselves."



26th March 1921) [Mr. C. V. Venkataraman Ayyangar]

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“There is a difference of Rs. 5,500 even after allowing for establishment. I do not think that the cost of establishment for each Inspector can be Rs. 2,000 a year. As we know, the establishment of these Inspectors costs very little. Therefore it is but reasonable to think, that the overseas allowance has been included in this Rs. 20,000. If an assurance is given that there will be no overseas allowance and that the three Inspectors will be Indians, we shall be satisfied.”

Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB :—“I move that the question be now put.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“As a matter of practice, Sir, I suggest that questions should not be put before either the mover has replied or before any member of Government has had an opportunity of saying what he wanted to say. Otherwise I submit, that a debate in this House may be absolutely one-sided. I am sorry to see that closure is applied somewhat indiscriminately in this House. I regret to say that the practice which was prevalent in the last Council of a member of Government getting up at an early stage of the proceedings and making a statement on behalf of the Government is not being adopted. At least in this sitting of the Council this is not the case, for I believe Mr. Ramaswami Mudaliyar has made a statement on behalf of the Government.”

The Hon'ble Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—“Personally speaking, I am against closure. I wish that the proceedings were not limited to any time and that speakers were allowed to speak. But on this question of closure there is a discretion and if the House wants information, certainly it is open to the Council to say so. The President is only putting to the vote a motion for closure made by an Honourable Member.”

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—“May I draw the attention of the House to the practice prevailing in the Indian Legislative Assembly? There the closure is never applied before a mover has replied. Even if an Honourable Member moves for a closure, the President has always the discretion to prevent indiscriminate or reckless abuse of the rule about closure. If the motion is put to the vote before the mover has had any chance of replying, it will be really unfair. I only wish that the practice that is now followed in the Legislative Assembly may be followed here. Before the closure is moved, the mover and the official member must have a chance of replying.”

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—“I think after what has fallen from some Honourable Members I should say a few words. So far as the President is concerned, I presume all members will agree that he has absolutely no right to compel any member to speak, be it a member of the Executive Council or any of the Ministers. It is not for the President to decide and sit in judgment over the members of Government as to when they should speak and why they have not spoken. Nor is it for the President to ascertain whether the mover of a resolution is or is not going to reply. When the debate has reached a certain stage and it appears to be probably the feeling of a large majority of the House that they have had enough of the debate, it is the duty of the President to give them the opportunity of expressing that wish. And that is the object with which the closure motion is put, and while it will be absolutely irrelevant for us to examine whether till now the closure has or has not been rightly applied, may I point out that in the large majority of cases where the closure has been actually applied, it has been carried unanimously and in a very small percentage of cases, where it has

[The Hon'ble the President]

[26th March 1921]

not been carried unanimously, it has been carried by an overwhelming majority. I take it that that means that in all these cases a very large majority of the members felt that they had had enough of the debate. At the same time I quite agree that it would be convenient to this House generally—and in so saying, I believe I am voicing the opinion not of this or of that party but of all Honourable Members—if at a sufficiently early stage of the debate, the member of the Government in charge should get up and explain the position of the Government. It will focus the discussion and enable the Government and the House to know clearly what the issues are. I would also appeal to honourable movers that they should, instead of waiting until the closure falls upon them, get up in good time and offer to make a reply; in which case, it is true that they run the chance of some members speaking after them, but they would be well advised not to wait for what they may consider to be the psychological moment. It is not expected of me, as President, to adjust a debate with such a degree of precision and to watch over the proceedings to such nicety, as to call upon the mover to offer his remarks at the last possible moment or to make him quite certain that there is nobody else ready to speak after him.

“We are working the Standing Orders for all that they are worth and it must be remembered that the President is after all the mouthpiece of the House. He has no authority independently of the House or of the Standing Orders which he has to interpret and apply. I cannot therefore give any guarantee that I will not agree to apply the closure till the Government member has spoken or till the mover has had an opportunity of doing so. It will be well for the Government member to speak at a fairly early stage to show what the wishes of the Government are. But Government members are not bound to do it. There is no obligation to do so if the Government feel at any time that in regard to any particular subject the public interest will be best served by allowing the discussion to go forward without their participating in it.

“The mover also may at times feel that the debate has taken such a turn and that so many people have spoken on behalf of his motion that he need not make another speech, in which case he will be perfectly entitled not to reply. It is no function of the President to find out what is passing in the mind of the mover, whether he is waiting to be called on or whether he is satisfied that no reply is necessary; but it is the function of the President, when he considers that the debate has reached a certain stage and when he thinks that there is a general consensus of opinion in the House that the debate should be closed, to allow that consensus to prevail. If he does not do so, he will not be fulfilling his duty; he will be taking a grave responsibility on himself in such cases by withholding the closure.

“I therefore now call upon the House to say what their wishes are with regard to the motion for closure.”

The motion for closure was carried by 46 votes against 30.

Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao demanded a poll.

A poll was taken with the following result :—

*Ayes.*

1. The Hon'ble Sir Lionel Davidson.
2.     "     Mr. C. G. Todhunter.
3.     "     Khan Bahadur Muhammad  
           Habib-ul-Jah Sahib Bahadur.
4.     "     Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
5.     "     Diwan Bahadur A. Subbarayalu  
           Reddiyar.
6.     "     Mr. P. Ramarayaningar.

7. The Hon'ble Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi  
           Nayudu.
8. Mr. F. J. Richards.
9.     "     R. G. Grieve.
10.   "     A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.
11.   "     E. Periyanyakam.
12.   "     S. R. Y. Ankinedu Prasad.
13.   "     R. Appaswami Nayudu.



26th March 1921]

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 14. Rao Bahadur V. Appaswami Vandayar.     | 34. Diwan Bahadur P. Kesava Pillai.                 |
| 15. Diwan Bahadur C. Arunachala Mudaliyar. | 35. Diwan Bahadur D. Seshagiri Rao Pantulu.         |
| 16. Rao Sahib P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu.     | 36. Mr. M. D. Devadas.                              |
| 17. Mr. K. P. Gopala Menon.                | 37. " A. T. Palmer.                                 |
| 18. " A. T. Muthukumaraswami Chettiyar.    | 38. " G. Vandanam.                                  |
| 19. Dr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar.               | 39. Khan Sahib Muhammad Abdur Rahman Sahib Bahadur. |
| 20. Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro.               | 40. Monshi Muhammad Abdur Rahman Sahib Bahadur.     |
| 21. Mr. K. Sarabha Reddi.                  | 41. Ahmad Miran Sahib Bahadur.                      |
| 22. " R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar.          | 42. Mr. A. D. M. Bavotti Sahib.                     |
| 23. " S. T. Shanmukham Pillai.             | 43. " Saiyid Muhammad Padsha Sahib.                 |
| 24. " N. A. V. Somasundaram Pillai.        | 44. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur.      |
| 25. " A. Subbarayudu.                      | 45. Mr. A. M. MacDougall.                           |
| 26. " T. C. Tangavelu Pillai.              | 46. Rao Bahadur T. Namburumal Chettiyar.            |
| 27. " O. Tanikachala Chettiyar.            | 47. Rao Sahib P. Venkatarangayya.                   |
| 28. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu. | 48. Rev. E. M. Macphail.                            |
| 29. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar.        | 49. Mr. R. E. Rencontre.                            |
| 30. " M. C. Raja.                          |   |
| 31. " L. C. Guruswami.                     |   |
| 32. " R. T. Kesavulu Pillai.               |   |
| 33. " M. C. Madura Pillai.                 |   |

*Noes.*

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu.           | 15. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu. |
| 2. Mr. K. Gopalakrishnayya.                    | 16. Mr. P. Siva Rao.                       |
| 3. " P. C. Muthu Chettiyar.                    | 17. Sriman Biswanath Das.                  |
| 4. " T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar.                | 18. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu.     |
| 5. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Punja.               | 19. Mr. K. V. Ramachari.                   |
| 6. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.                | 20. Rao Bahadur Dr. C. B. Rama Rao.        |
| 7. " T. Sivasankaram Pillai.                   | 21. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao.                 |
| 8. " S. Somasundaram Pillai.                   | 22. Mr. K. Sadasiva Bhat.                  |
| 9. Diwan Bahadur K. Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu. | 23. Sriman Sasibushana Rath.               |
| 10. Mr. A. Tangavelu Nayagar.                  | 24. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar.             |
| 11. Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao.          | 25. " M. Suryanarayana Pantulu.            |
| 12. Mr. S. Srinivasa Ayyangar.                 | 26. Rao Bahadur K. S. Venkatarama Ayyar.   |
| 13. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar.           | 27. Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar.      |
| 14. " L. A. Govindaraghava Ayyar.              | 28. " S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar.              |
|  | 29. The Raja of Ramnad.                    |
|  | 30. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampar.             |

The motion for the closure of the debate was carried by 49 voting *for*, 30 voting *against*.

The main motion of Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar (No. 47) to reduce by Rs. 5,000 the provision of Rs. 20,000 for the appointment of an additional Inspectress and of additional Inspectors was then put to the vote and declared lost.

Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar demanded a poll.

A poll was taken with the following result:—

*Ayes.*

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu.       | 16. Sriman Biswanath Das.                   |
| 2. Mr. P. C. Muthu Chettiyar.              | 17. Mr. S. Muttumanikkachari.               |
| 3. " T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar.            | 18. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu.      |
| 4. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Punja.           | 19. Mr. K. V. Ramachari.                    |
| 5. Mr. T. Sivasankaram Pillai.             | 20. Rao Bahadur Dr. C. B. Rama Rao.         |
| 6. " N. A. V. Somasundaram Pillai.         | 21. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao.                  |
| 7. " A. Subbarayudu.                       | 22. Mr. K. Sadasiva Bhat.                   |
| 8. " A. Tangavelu Nayagar.                 | 23. Sriman Sasibushana Rath.                |
| 9. " V. C. Vellingiri Gounder.             | 24. Diwan Bahadur D. Seshagiri Rao Pantulu. |
| 10. Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao.      | 25. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar.              |
| 11. Mr. S. Srinivasa Ayyangar.             | 26. " M. Suryanarayana Pantulu.             |
| 12. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar.       | 27. Rao Bahadur K. S. Venkatarama Ayyar.    |
| 13. " L. A. Govindaraghava Ayyar.          | 28. Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar.       |
|  | 29. " S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar.               |
|  | 30. " A. T. Palmer.                         |
| 14. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu. |   |
| 15. Mr. P. Siva Rao.                       |   |

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu]

[26th March 1921]

## Noes.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. The Hon'ble Sir Lionel Davidson.        | 26. Mr. S. Somasundaram Pillai.         |
| 2. " Mr. C. G. Todhunter.                  | 27. Diwan Bahadur K. Suryanarayanamurti |
| 3. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad                 | Nayudu.                                 |
| Habib-ullah Sahib Bahadur.                 | 28. Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai.         |
| 4. " Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar.            | 29. " O. Tanikachala Chettiyar.         |
| 5. " Diwan Bahadur A. Subbarayulu          | 30. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam      |
| Reddiyar.                                  | Nayudu.                                 |
| 6. " Mr. P. Kamarayaningar.                | 31. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar.     |
| 7. " Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi          | 32. " M. C. Raja.                       |
| Nayudu.                                    | 33. " L. C. Guruswami.                  |
| 8. Mr. F. J. Richards.                     | 34. " R. T. Kesavulu Pillai.            |
| 9. " R. G. Grieve.                         | 35. " M. C. Madurai Pillai.             |
| 10. " A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.              | 36. " M. D. Devadas.                    |
| 11. Dr. P. Subbarayan.                     | 37. " G. Vandanan.                      |
| 12. Mr. E. Periyannayagam.                 | 38. " Saiyid Diwan Abdul Razaak Sahib.  |
| 13. " S. R. Y. Ankinedu Prasad.            | 39. Khan Sahib Muhammad Abdur Rahman    |
| 14. " R. Appaswami Nayudu.                 | Sahib.                                  |
| 15. Rao Bahadur V. Appaswami Vandayar.     | 40. Munshi Muhammad Abdur Rahman Sahib. |
| 16. Diwan Bahadur C. Arunachala Mudaliyar. | 41. Mr. Ahmed Miran Sahib.              |
| 17. Rao Sahib P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu.     | 42. " A. D. M. Bayotti Sahib.           |
| 18. Mr. K. Gopalakrishnayya.               | 43. " A. P. I. Saiyid Ibrahim Ravuttar. |
| 19. " K. P. Gopala Menon.                  | 44. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib.  |
| 20. " A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar.    | 45. Mr. A. M. MacDougall.               |
| 21. Dr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar.               | 46. Rao Bahadur T. Namburmal Chettiyar. |
| 22. Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro.               | 47. Rao Sahib P. Venkatarangayya.       |
| 23. Mr. K. Sarabha Reddi.                  | 48. Rev. E. M. Macphail.                |
| 24. " R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar.          | 49. Mr. R. E. Rencontre.                |
| 25. " S. T. Shanmukham Pillai.             |   |

Thirty members voted for the motion and 49 against.

The Council adjourned for lunch at 2-15 p.m.

The Council reassembled after lunch at 2-45 p.m.

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"Sir, I have the honour to move—

'48. That in the demand under 31-E (b) (i) Education—General—Inspection the grant of Rs. 42,000 proposed for the appointment of additional Sub-Assistant Inspectors be omitted (Budget page 140).'

"What I am anxious to know is about the necessity for that provision notwithstanding the increase in the Inspectorate.

"I find that a lump provision alone is made. I wish to be satisfied whether any scheme which has already been sanctioned will be given effect to in the budget year. We find a provision of Rs. 41,000 under the same head in budget estimate of 1920-21 and nothing appears to have been utilized; and again we find a similar provision repeated for the next year, i.e., Rs. 42,000. An explanation is therefore required why even after one year it has not been found necessary to incorporate the provision in the general establishment of Sub-Assistant Inspectors. If it was not found necessary to do so during the course of this one year, what necessity is there for again having a lump provision without incorporating it in the general scheme? In the absence of that information I take it that there is no immediate necessity for this amount. Therefore this provision may be deleted and thus a retrenchment effected."

The Hon'ble Diwan Bahadur A. SUBBARAYULU REDDIYAR:—"The number of Sub-Assistant Inspectors to be employed is 18. When these 18 Sub-Assistant Inspectors are added to the existing staff, we will have a sufficient number to inspect and supervise at the rate of 150 schools per head. This provision is necessary because the 224 supervisors are kept untouched as we have no certainty as



26th March 1921] [The Hon'ble Mr. A. Subbarayulu Reddiyar]

to what the District Educational Councils will work like. We depend upon their success for absorbing this number. So far as the Sub-Assistant Inspectors are concerned, they are a necessary addition."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"I am not anxious to proceed with the matter further. But I expected the Hon'ble the Minister for Education to give an indication as to his difficulty in incorporating this provision in the general scale. There is this provision made for the current year, i.e., 1920-21, and we find the lump provision repeated for 1921-22 also. If the department had any definite scheme ready, I do not know what prevented them from incorporating this in the general scale. That the lump provision is repeated for two years without being incorporated in the general scale is a position which requires explanation."

The Hon'ble Diwan Bahadur A. SUBBARAYULU REDDIYAR:—"I will personally give the member the details later on."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"I understand from the Honourable Minister that he will furnish the details later on as he is not ready with them at present. I am not therefore anxious to press the motion to a division."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The following motion standing in the name of Mr. M. D. Devadoss was deemed to have been withdrawn as the member did not move it:—

'49. That under 31-E (b) (ii) —

(a) the provision of Rs. 42,000 for appointment of Additional Sub-Assistant Inspectors be reduced by Rs. 20,000 (Budget, page 140);

(b) the provision of Rs. 18,000 on account of the scheme for the transfer of certain posts from the Subordinate to the Provincial Educational Service be reduced by Rs. 10,000 (Budget, page 140).'

The following motion standing in the name of Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu was deemed to have been withdrawn as the member was absent:—

'50. That the demand under 31-E (b) (ii) for Rs. 20,000 for additional Inspectors, Rs. 42,000 for appointment of additional Sub-Assistant Inspectors and Rs. 18,000, being provision on account of the scheme for transfer of certain posts from the Subordinate to the Provincial Educational Service, be reduced to one rupee in each case (Budget, page 140).'

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR:—Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move—

'51. That under 31-E (b) (i) the provision of Working Expenses—General Direction—be reduced from Rs. 1,31,600 to Rs. 1,24,600 (Budget, page 138).'

"On page 138 of the budget, we find provision made for a number of officers whose salaries we should not touch because they are non-votable items. But if I refer to those officers it is to show that ample provision has already been made for the work of this department being done efficiently. We see that very often the Hon'ble the Director of Public Instruction has to attend Council sessions and surely there must be some one to take his place on such occasions, to attend to the regular work of the department. There is a Deputy Director, and considering the rapid growth in educational activity everywhere and the increase in the number of schools, it is also reasonable that he should be assisted by one Additional Deputy Director. Again, Sir, in consequence of the rapid development of women's education, it stands to reason that there should be a Deputy Directress of Education. But I do not see, Sir, any reason why there should be a Personal

[Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar]

[26th March 1921]

Assistant when the Director of Public Instruction has a regular establishment consisting of a manager, head clerk and other clerks. Again, Sir, I find a provision made of Rs 3,840 opposite 'Temporary Establishment.' There is also a tendency for the item of 'Purchase of Books and Maps' to swell and assume not a formidable figure but not a very modest figure of Rs. 1,500 — Rs. 400 more than what was provided for last year. I am a believer, Sir, in strenuous work. But when I say that, I do not mean to suggest or even to insinuate that these officers are not discharging their work most strenuously. My only object is to ask whether, with a judicious distribution of work, certain portion of the work devolving upon the Director of Public Instruction and a certain definite portion devolving upon the other officers—granting the strenuous nature of the work done by them at present—it is not possible to make a modest retrenchment. I move this not only as a practical measure of retrenchment but also as a question of principle. There is a growing and widespread discontent that the school fees have been raised beyond reason or precedent and that the cost of education has become prohibitive. If we allow the establishments also to become very costly, very little money will be left for financing our education. Therefore, wherever it is possible to make retrenchment, it is the duty of this House to make retrenchment, especially when it does not in any way impair the efficiency of the work done by the officers. It is more as a question of principle, Sir, that I pray for this retrenchment. To some it may look like firing a cannon to shoot a fly because after all the amount is a trifle. To those, Sir, who deal in large figures, this may seem to be a trifle. But I believe that we must also insist on these trifles—these crumbs as it were—being got and collected and a sum freed for other and more urgent purposes."

MR. R. G. GRIEVE:—"Mr. President, Sir, I find it rather difficult to give a reply to a motion which has ranged over such a large number of topics. As far as I can make out, the mover wants me to get rid of my Personal Assistant, my temporary establishment and my maps and books. I assure the Honourable Member that the work in the Director's office and the work done by all these officers seems to get more strenuous day by day and with the increasing expansion of education, it is difficult to make any reduction."

"I may remind the Honourable Member that the Hon'ble the Finance Member speaking the other day said that the heads of departments have been asked to examine their budgets in detail and scrutinize them, so as to see in what direction economies can be effected. I presume that I shall have to look over these items in this connexion and consider if a reduction is possible. I therefore request the Honourable Member not to press the resolution."

MR. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR:—"With the assurance given by the Director of Public Instruction that he will look into this matter and try his best, I think I need not press this motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

MR. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR then moved—

"52. That the provision under 31-E (b) (ii) Inspection, be reduced from Rs. 13,57,800 to Rs. 11,57,800 (Budget, page 138)."

In doing so, he said:—"Here again, Sir, my object in bringing a motion for reduction is to draw the attention of the House to certain forces and influences at work which make inspection not so very important or so very necessary at least in certain branches of education. First we have the results of the Public Examination. The schools that show very good results always or for a number of years might be taken to be run on very good lines. And what the inspecting officers



26th March 1921]

[Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar]

have to do is to check the registers and to see what could be done for the greater efficiency of instruction imparted in these institutions. Secondly, Sir, there is healthy competition or rivalry between the institutions situated in the same locality. The old order has changed and in a locality where we have two or three or even four schools we find the students are very sharp to know not only the merits of their teachers but also perceive their defects. They compare the respective abilities of their teachers and the merits of the methods adopted by the different assistants. Again, the parents also think twice before they send their children to a school. They want to know what the results are and whether they are satisfactory. They hear a lot of things from others before they make up their minds to send their children to one school or another. There is also public opinion. Some kind of pressure is certainly brought to bear upon the heads of these institutions by the very fact that their doings are watched by the public. Then we have the press and any irregularity, anything that takes place in a school is reported and becomes public property. So then, the public examination results, the principle of healthy competition, public opinion and the press act as a check on the institutions. Under these circumstances, is it really necessary to increase the inspecting staff? As for the Sub-Assistant Inspectors for inspecting elementary schools, I do not object to one Sub-Assistant Inspector being appointed to each taluk, and after the assurance given by the Hon'ble the Director of Public Instruction that the supervisors will be shifted on to other branches of the department, I do not press that point again. Then we have the question, Sir, of the Assistant Inspectors. I believe that the Assistant Inspectors will not be a permanent fixture in the department. However, on this point, I should like to have an assurance from the Director of Public Instruction. Coming now to the Inspectors, is it really necessary to have one Inspector for each district? I do not, here, raise the question of the nationality to which they belong, for I care only for efficiency. The work of the Inspector will be, not so much to inspect schools, but perhaps to supervise the work of the Sub-Assistant Inspectors. At present we know that the Inspector stops for a day or two and in some cases for three days at a place. If notice was previously given, the Sub-Assistant Inspectors might meet him there and he could check their work. He is not expected to go to the remote corners of the district. Therefore reduction on that head, I think, is possible. And again I admit the force of the argument of the Hon'ble Reverend Macphail, that heads of aided schools who do supervising work should not be forgotten."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"I rise to a minor point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member has suggested that a reduction in the number of Inspectors is possible. He is dealing with the aggregate under this sub-head of this grant, but in order to work up his case he takes item by item. This, the first item, is a non-votable item."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT:—"I think there are Provincial cadre of Inspectors. That is votable."

MR. S. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"Only if an omission or a reduction of a non-votable item is asked for, it is out of order. If we raise a general debate or a general question of policy by a reduction on the aggregate figure demanded, it cannot be regarded as out of order."

MR. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR (continuing):—"What I mean, Sir, is that a great deal depends upon the personality of the inspecting officer. If we have half a dozen men of vast experience, they would certainly be able to give a tone

[Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar]

[26th March 1921]

and shape to the whole educational system. It is that kind of inspection that should be brought to bear upon educational agencies by the inspecting officers. Therefore, I think that there is room for retrenchment. Another reason which compels me to pray for reduction, as I have already observed, is that if establishments are suffered to grow costly, where will money be found for other purposes? If it is possible for us to make the educational system less costly to the Indian taxpayer, it is our duty certainly to try our best to see that the establishment is rendered less costly than it actually is. It is only on these grounds, Sir, that I press for the adoption of this resolution."

Mr. R. G. GRIEVE :—"Sir, as the honourable mover has asked me one or two specific questions, I may answer them first. He asked, in the first place, whether the Assistant Inspectors would be a permanent fixture of our educational system. It is expected that they will not be. If we get an Inspector for each district and Deputy Inspectors under them, it is not intended that there should be any Assistant Inspectors.

"The honourable mover began his remarks by suggesting that there were several reasons which made it unnecessary to have such searching inspection as in the past. He said that it was less important in schools which are well staffed. He also said that the boys in these schools see the merits and defects of the teachers. Parents and public opinion are also said to bring pressure to bear on institutions. I do not know whether the honourable mover is thinking of his own school. But you have to remember that all schools are not of the standard and excellence which has been attained by St. Joseph's College.

"The Inspector must be able to see all the schools in the district in detail and I dissent entirely from the proposition that the inspecting officers are not to go to the remote parts of the district. The Inspectors should see every part of the district and acquaint themselves with every aspect of it, and not confine themselves to the towns and the more important schools. If we have one Inspector for each district, as I hope we shall have in time to come, it will be part of their duty to keep themselves in touch with every aspect of education and every part of the district, however out of the way it may be.

"I do not know if there is anything further that I need say on the question of the personnel of the inspecting staff. This has been dealt with in another connexion this morning. I do not think that the reduction of two lakhs proposed by the honourable mover is practicable."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"Sir, I have given notice of a motion similar to that proposed by Mr. Arpudaswami Udaiyar, and that is this :—

'53. *That the provision of Rs. 15,31,400 under 31-E (B) Education—General be reduced by Rs. 1,50,000.*'

"I take this opportunity of offering a few remarks. I entirely agree with the Honourable Member who spoke that this costly inspecting agency is unnecessary. Their work mainly consists in countersigning salary bills of the schools under local bodies, the salary and contingent bills of Municipal Secondary schools inspecting the offices of the Assistant and Sub-Assistant Inspectors and see that their registers are maintained properly. I do not think that an Inspector is necessary for this part of the work."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I must again raise the same point of order. The particular proposition now urged relates to the abolition of Inspectors. I say that the provision for such officers is a non-votable item. I seek your ruling that he cannot attack the item of Inspectors."



26th March 1921]

[The Hon'ble the President]

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT:—"I have no hesitation in giving an answer to that point. A specific motion asked for in a non-votable grant will be out of order. But in a general motion where opportunity is taken to review the whole matter it is perfectly open to the Honourable Member to condemn or find fault with the administration even of a non-votable item, because he is putting forward suggestions for the consideration of the Government. What the House is asked to decide is to make a total reduction under the head Education. Otherwise it is difficult for the administration of any department to be criticised. I would rather allow it."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"It is I am aware, entirely out of order to discuss any ruling of the President, but Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar has proposed a reduction of not a nominal sum but of Rs. 1,50,000. I am merely inviting your attention, Sir, to this fact."

Diwan Bahadur L. A. GOVINDARAGHAVA AYYAR:—"Is the Hon'ble Sir Lionel Davidson in order in discussing this after the President's ruling?"

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT:—"There is no doubt that when Honourable Members wish to bring forward or table a motion for reduction of a grant solely for the purpose of criticising the general administration of any particular branch it would be wise to make the amount of reduction sufficiently small. They have not, either to-day or on any of the previous days, done so. The sum put down may perhaps appear unnecessarily large. My object in making the remark is that if the sum is large and the resolution is carried, it will seriously handicap the administration. It is wise to table a resolution to reduce a grant say by Rs. 100 so that the administration of the department may not be paralysed by the reduction. I only say it for future guidance. We are all feeling our way in regard to these things. I would ask Honourable Members to realize the distinction between motions which are intended to effect a substantial economy or bring about retrenchment and those which are intended to support a general criticism of the particular branch of the administration. If a motion is meant to draw the attention of the Government to the general feeling about the administration of a department, a proposal to reduce the grant by a fairly small sum will be quite sufficient. Then the Government will understand clearly what it is the Honourable Member has in view. I take it that so far as this motion is concerned the Honourable Member wishes to secure not so much this a particular reduction, as an opportunity for general criticism and to draw the attention of the Government to this branch of administration."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR (*continuing*):—"Coming to their inspection they are supposed to inspect secondary schools. As regards the futility of their inspection of secondary schools it is amply proved. Still more unnecessary it is in the case of colleges."

Mr. R. G. GRIEVE:—"Inspectors of schools do not inspect colleges."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Then, Sir, their work is so much the less. They have no inspection of colleges and so they have no work to do. They have to attend to the other part of the education of the district. That means he is to see to the primary education. I ask whether it is possible for an Inspector to attend to this part of the work in any satisfactory manner. In those cases where the Inspectors are Europeans their disability is still more than in the case of Indians. They are ignorant of the language and they can do nothing as regards inspection of schools. Further they tour 30 or 40 miles a day and inspect 3

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

[26th March 1921]

schools in a day at a stretch. They give probably 15 minutes for each school. What sort of inspection can they possibly carry on and what good can they do to teachers? They give due notice to the Assistant Inspectors and Sub-Assistant Inspectors and Supervisors who keep the whole thing ready for the Inspector's inspection. Naturally inspection conducted after so elaborate arrangements is not worth anything at all. There is one other aspect. There are going to be sanctioned the new District Educational Councils. I think they will attend to this work very well. So the need for so costly an inspecting agency will not be felt. What is the use of making the administration so costly even after the grant of self-government. I appeal to the Council to ventilate their views in this matter and vote for reduction of this costly agency. Objection was taken to my quoting something from the Inspection Manual. It says that Sub-Assistant Inspectors can transfer as much work as is necessary to the Supervisors—."

Mr. R. G. GRIEVE (*interrupting*):—"I said that in special cases where necessary Sub-Assistant Inspectors could transfer to Supervisors the work of annual inspection of elementary schools. This is the exception and not the rule."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"Supervisors are mainly appointed for the purpose of opening new schools and organising them. As I have already pointed out these Supervisors have absolutely failed in this respect. Because there has been a progressive decrease in the number of schools year after year that will be a further ground, I think, for this House to make up its mind and show its clear view in this matter that the grant under this head might be reduced."

Mr. S. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"Sir, I have given notice of a similar resolution and I do not intend moving that separately. Now that education is a transferred subject, it is most important that the Council concentrated its attention upon the reform of education. I do not suggest that the Hon'ble the Minister is not laying down a new policy this year and has failed to discharge his duties. It is too soon to expect him to make any declaration as to the change of policy so far as education is concerned. I recognize that natural limitation. I would suggest that the House should consider the points, which I wish to place before it. In the first place, I think, we are not concerned so much with this 'Direction and Inspection' as with secondary education in general. We have been discussing for a considerable time as to what amount should be spent in 'Direction and Inspection'. What really lies at the heart of the members who spoke on the subject is that the present system of secondary education is not satisfactory and they want that as much money as possible should be spent on the expansion and reorganization of secondary education so that it may be more fruitful, more vocational and more helpful to the land. We feel most strongly that the increasing expenditure under the head of direction and inspection is not at all justifiable. I do feel that similar demands like this should not be made hereafter. It is impossible to justify the policy that there should be for each district an Inspector of the Indian Educational Service rising to a pay of Rs. 1,750. Because if you go on doing this, there will be very little money left for other purposes. A great deal has been said about the Public Services Commission and their recommendations. I agree with some of the speakers that the whole matter requires re-examination. The Public Services Commission made its original recommendations without reference to the reforms, without reference to the fact that the reforms were going to place education as a transferred subject and without reference to the change of ideals in education that has now been brought about. Now if education is going to be administered as a transferred subject, all the items under that head should be



26th March 1921]

[Mr. S. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

votable. I consider that the Minister should so devise his educational policy hereafter as to enable the representatives of the people in a Council like this to express their views as to what should be a sound educational policy. That can only be done if this 'Direction and Inspection' is made a votable item. For that purpose what appears to me to be necessary—it is impossible for me to go into the details—is to consider what the Calcutta University Commission suggested. It is time that the Government takes up the idea of establishing a Board of Secondary Education in this province and so devolve much of the work of inspection on to this representative body. That is the general ideal which has received considerable amount of support in this country. I hope that the Hon'ble the Minister will carefully examine that proposal because this will effect a considerable reduction under the head of direction and inspection. This Board may not supersede the necessity for some inspecting body, still it will reduce to a great extent that necessity. Just as the District Educational Council will supersede the necessity for increased inspecting staff as regards elementary education, similarly I expect the Board of Secondary Education will make it to some extent unnecessary. I agree that in the case of elementary education inspection will have to be continued. In the case of secondary education the cause of a superfluous inspecting agency has not been really made out. I do not know what the value of inspection is. But experts who have spoken about it in this Council were not satisfied with the quality of the inspection. No doubt the Director of Public Instruction has said that it is necessary. But the point of view is whether the institutions and the public at large and the educationists feel the necessity. I have spoken to many teachers, many headmasters of high schools and they all recognize that this inspection is not of a substantial and genuine nature. It cannot in the very nature of things be genuine. The headmaster and staff of high schools are men of high educational qualifications. It is the duty of the Government to trust the heads of these high schools to see that the education which is imparted is made better. Just as colleges do not have periodical inspection by the Government inspecting agency, similarly, I think the high schools need not have the elaborate inspecting agency which is now employed. While in the case of elementary schools there may be such an agency the case for secondary education being periodically inspected has not been satisfactorily made out. I can only express the general sense of the teaching profession, the general sense of those whose representative I am in this Council, that they really do not feel that this 'Direction and Inspection', is on this scale and to this extent necessary. I suggest to the Hon'ble the Minister that he should carefully examine whether it is not possible to reduce this inspecting agency, whether it is not possible to make direction and inspection as far as possible a votable item in the next year's budget. I would ask for a new policy from this democratic assembly and the new ministry. I would ask for a more radical and sounder policy of a thoroughly national education particularly in the field of secondary education."

The Hon'ble Diwan Bahadur A. SUBBARAYULU REDDIYAR :—"I beg to express my thanks to the speakers this afternoon."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"I should like to say a word by way of explanation. Educational schemes costing several lakhs of rupees are being considered and the schemes are sent up to the Secretary of State for sanction. Recurring establishments are being increased and additions are being made to the Indian Educational Service, and when these schemes relate to appointments sanctioned by the Secretary of State in services which are not classed as

[Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu] [26th March 1921]

provincial service the items become non-votable. I would therefore suggest to the Honourable Ministers that in the departments which are under their control if schemes are submitted to the Secretary of State for sanction and the details of these schemes or rather the expenditure covering all these schemes is placed on the non-votable list, it is perfectly clear that we in this House will have absolutely no chance of examining them. For example, during the last two days, it has been announced by you, Sir, that His Excellency the Governor has ruled that certain appointments which have been placed in the budget have in consequence of communications received from the Secretary of State been placed on the non-votable list. Therefore, I suggest for the consideration of the Honourable Ministers, who are in charge of these departments, that wherever there is a scheme which has to go to the Secretary of State and in consequence has to be declared non-votable if it is sanctioned, the best course the Ministers can adopt is to ascertain the sense of the House before it is submitted to the Secretary of State. That is a matter of extreme importance, because (if these rulings which you have communicated to us are correct and represent the law on the subject) the items become non-votable, and the financial power of this House is at an end. Therefore I suggest to the Honourable Ministers that in regard to the departments in their hands any schemes which, in consequence of being submitted to the Secretary of State become non-votable, they should be submitted to the consideration of this House before they are so submitted. That is all I have to say."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"I do not want to waste your time or the time of the House with any lengthy remarks on the subject. There is one statement which has been made by Mr. S. Srinivasa Ayyangar. He pressed on the Minister for Education the desirability of establishing a board of secondary education. I believe, Sir, it is within the knowledge of many members of this House that this identical proposal was put before the Senate, I believe, by the Honourable Member himself. That proposal after a full debate was negatived by an overwhelming majority of something like 50 to 5. I merely mention this as an indication that even if my Honourable Colleague, the Minister for Education, does his best in the matter, the Senate of the University of Madras is not likely to accept that recommendation."

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"I have to say a word after what has been said by the Hon'ble Sir Lionel Davidson on the subject. The proposals made by the Saddler Commission were examined by a committee of the Senate, and this provision with regard to the appointment of a board for secondary education was actually recommended by that committee. It was only when the matter came before the Senate there were proposals made to veto the recommendation of the Committee and then it was vetoed. The committee of deliberation has recommended this particular thing. So it cannot be said that it is the undoubted opinion of the Senate or the opinion of the committee of the Senate.

"It is a question which requires the very urgent consideration of this Council and I believe whatever the opinion of the Senate may be in a matter like that, it is ultimately for this House to consider the question and decide it. I, for one, am all for the proposal to appoint that committee of secondary and intermediate education, and that is the only way in which popular opinion can be brought to bear on secondary and intermediate education in this country and to curtail the ever-increasing cost of inspection and direction.

"Well, Sir, I also agree with Mr. Ramachandra Rao in regard to the way in which we are committed to this expenditure. A number of appointments are made



26th March 1921] [Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar]

without our knowledge. I do not see, Sir, whether there can be any object gained by calling these subjects transferred subjects if large expenses like this are incurred without any reference to this Council. (Hear, hear.) And appointments are recommended to the Secretary of State and sanctioned by him. I submit that is a misnomer to call these subjects transferred subjects if appointments carrying huge salaries are going to be dealt with in that way. It is an important thing that this Council should be taken into confidence before any recommendation is made to the Secretary of State. I hope, Sir, that hereafter at least they will be more considerate towards us and take us into confidence as the Council is expected to be responsible for these subjects and the Ministers are only exercising the power of the Council connected with the administration of the departments placed under their control.

"I have already said that the expenditure that has been incurred on officers is out of all proportion to the necessity. For elementary education and secondary education, there is very little provision made, in addition to what has been made last year or the year before last. So we are practically robbing the primary and secondary education by giving huge salaries to a few officers and increasing the number of establishments. I do not consider, Sir, it is a very good policy to pursue. So I gladly support the motion."

Mr. P. SIVA RAO:—"I wish to say a few words on this motion for reduction. This is the only opportunity for saying anything against the extraordinary way in which expenditure is incurred in the case of this department. Let it not be misunderstood that we are grudging any money to be usefully spent under the head Education. I wish to say a few words about the Board of Secondary Education. The Hon'ble Sir Davidson was pleased to say that the Senate in an open meeting had completely negatived any such proposal for the formation of a board so far as this Presidency was concerned."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"I did not say the Senate completely negatived the proposal for the formation of such an institution so far as this Presidency is concerned. I only wanted to draw attention to the fact that the subject had been debated in the Senate and that the proposals were there negatived by an overwhelming majority."

Mr. P. SIVA RAO:—"Let me take the phraseology of the Hon'ble Sir Lionel Davidson just to avoid his getting up on a point of order. I know something about this question because I myself moved in the last Council for the appointment of a committee to enter into the question of secondary education and examine the Saddler's report on the Calcutta University. They examined the findings of the Calcutta University Commission. I was told that the committee had appointed a sub-committee and that that committee would suffice for the present purpose. Their recommendations have been received. There has been time for Government to consider the same, the University has not said the last word merely for the reason that the University has got absolutely nothing to do with secondary education. The matter is entirely in the hands of the Government and the last word has to be said by the Government. Steps have to be taken to draw the attention of this House to the recommendations of the Saddler Commission."

"As regards secondary education, the University can only deal with it so far as the professors and teachers in Colleges are concerned. As regards the extraordinary expenditure that has been incurred, I find that so many new appointments have been created, appointments of deputy directors, appointments of deputy directresses and new inspectors and new appointments of inspectresses and so forth.

[Mr. P. Siva Rao]

[26th March 1921]

It is also recommended that all the 30 inspectors should be drawn from the Indian Educational Service. I do not see what the recommendation is, but that is the provision in the budget. There is the overseas allowance in the case of European members of the Indian Educational Service. One way of bringing about retrenchment in this case is to largely indianize these services and the second way is to protest against the way in which these appointments have been created behind our back. At the last moment the sanction of the Secretary of State is received and the House has no opportunity to raise its voice against the various appointments created, recommended and recruited."

MR. A. T. PALMER :—" Mr. President, I think we must congratulate ourselves that secondary education has become a transferred subject. I am sure the Minister in charge will do a great deal in the furtherance and improvement of secondary education. I am not going to vote in favour of this resolution, but I should like to say some words regarding the appointment of the board of secondary education. It is a very good idea, for it will correct some mistakes in the inspection that are in vogue at present. One of these, Sir, is the great part that the idiosyncrasies of inspectors play in inspection, for the Inspector seems to have his own pet ideas, his own pet theories, and no two Inspectors seem to agree on any matter. Here is an Inspector that comes down upon the headmaster because he has too many note-books ; here is another Inspector that comes down on the headmaster because there are too few note-books and so on and so forth. The headmasters and the teachers are put to endless trouble year after year according to the change of Inspectors.

" Then, again, Sir, with regard to text-books, here is an Inspector who is very fond of one particular text-book, and the whole Circle where he is to buy that. Then comes another Inspector. He does not like that text-book, but recommends some other text-book, and the whole lot of text-books bought before are thrown away and new books are bought at considerable expense and at considerable loss of money. All these things are done. I beg that these defects be taken into consideration and removed by the Minister in charge."

MR. S. T. SHANMUKHAM PILLAI :—" Mr. President, the Reforms Act has just opened a new era and a new chapter in the history of the administration of the country. This Council has been constituted for the guidance of the new Government, as we see from the speeches on the budget so far as have been dealt with. Every Department consumes a large proportion of the country's revenues and none the less the Department of Education. To make the present self-government a success as I observed the other day, we have to find money for the various public purposes. Unless we are able to do so, this Council will have failed in its object. Therefore the only course for the Government to adopt is that the whole machinery in each and every department should be overhauled and all the unnecessary establishments weeded out and the money thus saved should be devoted to the promotion of more useful objects. Wherever necessary the scales of pay of the establishments in all departments should be revised in view to economy combined with efficiency. This is what should be done ; so far as the budget estimate is concerned, we cannot interfere. It must stand as it is. But as soon as possible, the Government must appoint a committee for making a thorough investigation as to the requirements of each department, how each must be manned and the scales of pay fixed. The sooner this is done the better."

MR. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" The Honourable Member behind me has stated that Educational Department and other departments require a thorough



26th March 1921]

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

overhauling. He may not be wise in his suggestion, for that will bring on us only an unnecessary expenditure as we have found it to our cost when such committees were appointed in the past.

"I wish to say two things. The Government were, at any rate, till recently of the same opinion as we are expressing now, viz., that there is absolutely no need for increasing the costly educational agency. Here is something to prove my statement and I will read it to the Council.

"No doubt, elementary schools are increasing. Since the department insists on these schools being staffed with trained teachers the appointment of a large number of additional Inspectors is not a healthy policy, for the additional appointments involve the expenditure of a large amount of money which can well be utilized for giving grants to aided and private schools several of the last class being under the schoolmaster-managers." His Excellency the President referred to . . . . ."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"May I ask the Honourable Member to repeat what he is reading from. Those of us who are interested in the subject are quite unable to follow him."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"I am certainly going to mention that, Sir, if the Honourable the Home Member will have some patience."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—"It may be convenient to the members who have to reply to the debate."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"I am reading the proceedings of the Legislative Council with reference to the draft financial statement of 1919-20 presented to the Council by Sir Alexander Cardew. The first reference was by the Hon'ble Mr. Littlehales. That which I am now going to read is His Excellency's speech as President on that occasion.

"The Government takes great care to see that Municipal and Board schools are staffed properly with trained teachers. Aided schools are also required to employ only trained men. When such is the case the appointment of highly paid Inspectors is not desirable. The department spends more money on training schools and on Inspectors and less money in the shape of grants to schools under private management. The result is that teachers in private schools carry on their cheerless work decade after decade silently with patience and perseverance."

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDALIYAR :—"Sir, I am glad that members of this council have taken a very great interest in this matter and so far as I could gather from the speeches made by the Honourable Members, they are quite alive to the fact that the establishment both under the head of inspection and under the head of direction are becoming more and more costly and that an attempt ought to be made to see that they become less costly in the near future and the Honourable Member who read extracts from the speeches delivered in this House by His Excellency the President and by a distinguished Civilian has convinced the House of the necessity for a policy of retrenchment in order that more money may be set free to help and encourage institutions under private management.

"There is one other question to be considered and it is this. A word was dropped, viz., that the cutting down of Rs. 2 lakhs all of a sudden might result in some confusion and might prove dangerous. As no amendment has been proposed and as even the cutting down of the grant by Rs. 100 is likely to reflect on the department, I should like to have an assurance that the matter will be looked

[Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar]

[26th March 1921]

into carefully and that wherever possible this principle of retrenchment will be introduced. Should such an assurance be forthcoming, I think I shall withdraw my resolution."

The Hon'ble Diwan Bahadur A. SUBBARAYULU REDDIYAR :—" I am, Sir, prepared to give that assurance at once."

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR :—" I withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The following motion which stood in the name of Mr. S. Srinivasa Ayyangar was not moved and was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

' 54. That the grant of Rs. 13,18,525 under 31-E (b) Education—General be reduced by Rs. 1,00,000 (Budget page 138).'

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" I do not propose to withdraw my motion, Sir. I prefer that my resolution be put to the vote."

The motion No. 53 was put to the vote and lost, 11 voting for and 46 against.

Rao Bahadur K. S. VENKATARAMA AYYAR :—" Mr. President, I beg to move—

' 55. That the sum of Rs. 17,000 under travelling allowance No. 37-F. be reduced by Rs. 7,000.'

"In bringing forward this resolution before the Council I beg to invite the attention."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" May I know whether this motion has not already been passed? "

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—" It was motion No. 5 (a) on Demand No. IX that was passed."

Rao Bahadur K. S. VENKATARAMA AYYAR :—" I beg to invite the attention of the House to the figure Rs. 10,000 provided in the budget of 1920-21 and a sum of Rs. 9,450 in the accounts of 1919-20. I cannot really understand why this amount of Rs. 10,000 should be increased to Rs. 17,000. In other figures there seems to be absolutely no change except one item of fees which is put at Rs. 2,700 with reference to which I have not moved for reduction. It seems to be a new item. But all the other items are almost the same. It cannot be said that the scale of travelling allowances has increased. I find the only officer is the Secretary to the Commissioner and all the other items are remuneration to examiners. The remuneration is the same, because I know as a matter of fact that so much is paid for examination fee and so much for correction and valuation of each paper. I submit that a reduction of Rs. 7,000 could be properly made and the original amount of Rs. 7,000 only as we find in the estimate of 1920-21 be restored."

Mr. R. G. GRIEVE :—" May I just explain, Sir, that a major portion of the travelling allowances paid under this head is paid to non-officials. They come to Madras in connexion with the examination meetings and they have to get travelling allowances like anybody else. Their rates of allowances have gone up because those of officials have also gone up. Railway fares have increased and are likely to increase still further. Additional work has also been handed over to the Commissioner's office and I can assure the Honourable Member that the travelling allowances are necessary. The allotment will be fully utilized in connexion with the travelling allowances of official and non-official members of examination boards who come in from the mufassal to attend the various meetings such as special test examinations and technical examinations, etc."



26th March 1921]

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR moved :—

‘56. *This Council resolves that the grant of Rs. 1,56,63,000 under 31. Education be reduced by Rs. 1,50,000 (Budget page 120).’*

In doing so, he said :—“In regard to the demand at page 129 of the budget, we find provision is made for teaching grants. In the cost of maintaining elementary schools, the provision for a Principal or Superintendent in addition to the Headmaster is also included. I submit that the cost of a Principal or Superintendent should be left out of consideration. As things are, there is the Headmaster who has been relieved of much of his teaching work. He has to supervise the classes and the teachers under him. So I think any supervision that may be required in regard to the schools can reasonably be expected to be satisfactorily done by the Headmaster. I do not object to the Principal or the Superintendent, if no Government grants are asked on their account. When they submit their demand for grant, the managers include the pay of this Principal or Superintendent and thus claim a larger grant than otherwise they can get. I object to this system. It is stated sometimes that this Principal when he is a non-Indian imparts a superior tone to the high school. But I prefer an Indian to a European to impart this tone.

“Just as we have often said that good Government is no substitute for self-government so also we should say that no foreign tone, however good it be, can be a substitute for an Indian tone. So I do not see the need for including in the cost of a high school the amount paid to the Principal for whom we have no necessity. I see no reason for including that amount in calculating the grant. Further what is the work that the Principal does? How many hours does he teach apart from the religious instruction in the Bible or any other book, which is not of much concern to us? How many hours does he spend on secular teaching? If he spends only one hour and devotes the remaining hours to propaganda work, then I must emphatically object to the educational institution being made the means of supporting an agency which is not of an educational character.”

The Hon'ble Diwan Bahadur A. SUBBARAYULU REDDIYAR :—“I do not think, Sir, the Honourable Member has made out a case for reduction. Of course he dwelt at length on the possibility of the headmasters who are not engaged in teaching being able to control. All that does not bear on the point. It seems to me that there is not much to be said in favour of this resolution.”

The Rev. E. M. MACPHAIL :—“I wish to say a few words upon this resolution because I believe to be the only member of this House who has been in the position of a superintendent of a school with a headmaster working under him. We both had a large amount of work to do and were quite worth the grants we received—no, we were worth a great deal more for, as a matter of fact, we got no grants, nor do I believe that I imparted a bad tone to the school of which I was the superintendent, for there was always great pressure for admission. Judging therefore from my own case I maintain that there may be plenty of work in a school both for a superintendent and for a headmaster, and they may both deserve grants.”

The motion was then withdrawn by leave of Council.

The Hon'ble Diwan Bahadur A. SUBBARAYULU REDDIYAR :—“Mr. President, before the Demand No. XVI is put to vote, it remains for me to thank the whole Council for the very kind and hospitable treatment they have given me to-day.”

[The Hon'ble Mr. P. Ramarayaningar] [26th March 1921]

Demand No. XVI, namely, that a sum not exceeding 143·0 lakhs be granted to the Government for Education—Non-European, which was moved by the Hon'ble Diwan Bahadur A. Subbarayalu Reddiyar, was then passed by the Council.

## DEMAND XVII—MEDICAL.

The Hon'ble Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—" I move that a sum not exceeding 42·24 lakhs be granted under the head Medical, the details of which are given at pages 142 and 198 of the budget.

" Sir, under the head Medical, as little as can be demanded has been demanded and I am afraid the demand is not capable of any further reduction. I am aware that quite a large number of motions have been tabled for reduction and I dare say that the Honourable Members do not really wish to reduce this demand that has been made for Medical but that they have given notice of motions with a view probably to elicit information regarding the general policy of the Medical administration of the province."

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR moved—

‘ 1. That in 32 (b) Medical—Hospitals and dispensaries, Rs. 10,800 provided for a radiologist be deleted (Budget page 143).’

In doing so, he said :—" I do not really know what this radiologist is for and what his work is. If, as stated by some Honourable Members who spoke on the last occasion when the general discussion of the budget was taken, all the X-ray installations were going to be centred in the city of Madras, I can see the necessity for this provision. If that is the case and if the radiologist is to be stationed here and all cases of inspection are to be sent from the mufassal to Madras, then I certainly object to the proposal. If, on the other hand, he is only a specialist who is going to be consulted in difficult cases, if there are to be X-ray installations in all places and the system of fitting X-ray installations in the mufassal will also be encouraged, if that is the case and if this is the provision only for a specialist of that kind, I would not object to it."

The Hon'ble Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—" The institution will be located in the city of Madras but it will be open to any mufassal professional man to consult the specialist who will help the local practitioners in interpreting or taking the radiographs, from the central institution."

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" Is it that we are going to have only one installation in the city of Madras to which all cases are to be sent, or, are there going to be different installations in different places ?"

The Hon'ble Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—" The services of an expert are required to run the institution, and I think it will not be possible to have as many experts as there are districts in the province. Of course there would be institutions in some of the important mufassal stations but they may not be under the guidance of experts in all cases."

The motion was then withdrawn by leave of the Council.

The following motion which stood in the name of Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju was not moved by the Honourable Member and was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

‘ 2. Under 32 (b) Medical—Hospitals and dispensaries—Presidency hospitals—Duty allowance—omit Rs. 840 (Budget page 143).’



26th March 1921]

[Dr. C. B. Rama Rao]

The following motion which stood in the name of Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu was, owing to the absence of the Honourable Member, deemed to have been withdrawn :—

‘3. That the following item of duty allowance be omitted, 32 (b) Medical—Hospitals and dispensaries—Presidency hospitals—Duty allowance—omit Rs. 840 (Budget page 143).’

The following motion which stood in the name of Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju was not moved by the Honourable Member and was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

‘4. Under 32 (b) Medical to Civil Assistant Surgeon—omit Rs. 1,200 (Budget page 146).’

The following motions which stood in the name of Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu were, owing to the absence of the Honourable Member, deemed to have been withdrawn :—

‘5. Duty allowance to Civil Assistant Surgeon—omit Rs. 1,200 (Budget page 146).’

‘6. Duty allowance to compounders—Probationers and Local Fund—omit Rs. 30,192 (Budget page 147).’

Rao Bahadur Dr. C. B. RAMA RAO :—“ Mr. President, I beg to move the following :—

‘7. That the amount of Rs. 13,500 allotted under detailed account No. 32 (C)—Grants for medical purposes—for investigation of hook-worm disease be omitted (Budget page 149).’

“ Sir, my object in bringing this motion is this. Time was when hook-worm disease was not even heard of. It was not very long ago that it was discovered and the profession expected that some wonderful discoveries would be made and that it was an isolated disease which could be circumscribed and attacked and eventually destroyed. The members of the profession have been told by the specialists that as many as 90 per cent of the population at least more than 75 per cent of the population in the southern districts and as many as 50 per cent in the northern districts are suffering from this disease. So it comes to this, that it is no more important and no more serious disease than bronchitis or cold. It is a very common disease and so there is no necessity for having a separate officer and an establishment. As a matter of fact certain amount of preliminary investigation is necessary from a scientific point of view. A very eminent officer has been doing this work for several years past and I have known his work personally and he worked in my district when I was in medical charge of the Tanjore district. Before his services were indented upon, the question was investigated in certain Central Jails. When I was the medical officer in the Cannanore Central Jail, I trained two sub-assistant surgeons to go through the microscopic technique and we sent a report of a thousand cases which were investigated there. Now it may be safely stated that there is not a single medical man of any name or fame who does not know the technique of its investigation and the methods of treatment recommended for this disease. Such being the case, Sir, I do not see any special provision is necessary for this. I therefore request the House to delete that amount in order that it might be available for something more pressing.”

Mr. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—“ Sir, the investigation of hook-worm disease has been engaging the attention of the medical men all over the world. In America there is a committee sitting and large amounts of money have been spent

[Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar]

[26th March 1921]

over it. I hear that they are going to take a tour all over the world. In Bengal His Excellency Lord Ronaldshay is taking personal interest and a very keen interest in the affair. We know as the Honourable Member has already told that over 90 per cent of the residents of Madras are harbouring hook-worm in them. Every day we come across people suffering from anæmia which cannot be cured. They go to several Ayurvedic and Unani physicians and after all they come to English medical men. The modern English medical man readily diagnoses the disease by examining the faeces under the microscope in a trice and begins the correct treatment by administering thymol.

“But thymol, no doubt, is a very efficacious treatment in an hospital. But among the Indian homes especially where oil and ghee are so plentifully used, thymol is a very dangerous drug. Of course various other treatments have been introduced, but none was so very useful as thymol. In my opinion, this investigation should go on till a very safe remedy can be found out which can be handled by any medical man anywhere.”

Mr. A. T. PALMER :—“Sir, from the Publicity Bureau we learnt that this investigation of the hook-worm disease has become a past history and I have been asking many medical gentlemen about this disease and they have told me they have found out a remedy and they can very well tackle the disease now and that the trouble about it is over, at least regarding the remedy for it. My friend, the previous speaker, said that investigations are being carried on in other parts of the world in regard to this disease. Such being the case, I do not see the need for our spending money on this particular disease. So, I support the motion.”

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“Sir, lay members of this House, like myself, feel absolutely helpless now. One honourable gentleman, a very learned gentleman of the profession, my friend Dr. Rama Rao, gets up and says, ‘Don’t sanction this sum; it is absolutely useless.’ Another eminent gentleman of the same profession, Dr. Natesa Mudaliyar says, ‘No, allow it; it is very essential.’ Doctors like members of other professions notoriously differ from each other, and, in such circumstances, it seems to me that the safest course is to follow the Government who apparently must have put in this amount under the advice of their medical officer, the Surgeon-General. It seems to me, Sir, that this is the safest course and after all the amount is a petty sum of Rs. 13,500.”

The Hon’ble Mr. P. RAMA RAYANINGAR :—“Sir, as my honourable friend, Mr. Krishnan Nayar, has said, we of this House are bewildered between the speeches of the two contradicting doctors. One is for the reduction and the other insists upon the investigation to be carried on. However, it is well known that the hook-worm disease is one of the filthiest of the tropical diseases and that in southern India, and particularly in the damp districts of the Presidency, the disease is very common. The honourable mover himself has admitted that it prevails almost to the extent of 98 per cent among the people. This disease, however, is responsive to treatment. When it really responds to treatment, it is quite possible to get the disease under control only if we have the treatment ready. During my recent tour through the Northern Circars, I visited several hospitals in the delta portion of the district. Every hospital has its own tale of hook-worm patients, and it appears that in those parts the hook-worm disease is responsible for very many deaths. Although it is the duty of the local bodies and the Provincial Government to undertake investigation in connexion with this unfortunate disease, these bodies are really spending very little money upon the investigation of this fell disease. However two charitable institutions have come to the rescue of the



26th March 1921] [The Hon'ble Mr. P. Ramarayaningar]

Government and local bodies. One is the Indian Research Fund Association and the other is the International Health Board of New York. They have deputed their own paid doctors to undertake the investigation. So far as the investigation under the doctor deputed by the Research Fund Association is concerned, Government incurs no expense whatsoever. In the case of the other investigation, Government only pays the incidental expenditure. It pays for the salaries of the subordinate staff and perhaps for printing and other minor items of expenditure. The whole expenditure amounts to Rs. 13,500. But if the Government or local bodies undertake the investigation, it might cost perhaps ten times as much. I cannot understand why Dr. Rama Rao has thought it fit to ask for a reduction of this item. Spending Rs. 13,500 we are really able to get service worth ten times that amount. In these circumstances, I find it impossible to accept Dr. Rama Rao's recommendation."

Rao Bahadur Dr. C. B. RAMA RAO :—"Sir, I never said that the investigation was not necessary. It being a universal disease and the investigation having been taken up under the direction of the head of the department by almost every large hospital and in every jail hospital and all teaching institutions, medical colleges, General Hospital, and so on, there is no necessity for a separate officer; his pay and other things were being borne by some other agency till now. He has been working for more than six years. I have known him for about five years at least and it is only this year that it has been put on the Provincial budget. Since we are not very well off in funds and money is required for more pressing demands, I thought that a special investigation was unnecessary."

The Hon'ble Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—"May I rise to correct the speaker, Sir? He says that his pay comes from Provincial funds. That is not a fact."

Rao Bahadur Dr. C. B. RAMA RAO :—"I beg to draw the attention of the House to page 149 of the Budget. There is a blank under accounts for 1919-20 and there is only Rs. 5,000 for 1920-21 and for 1921-22 the amount suddenly jumps up to Rs. 13,500."

The Hon'ble Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—"That does not mean the pay. I have already stated that we have undertaken to pay the incidental expenses."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—"I think that can be accepted. Does the Honourable Member press his motion?"

Rao Bahadur Dr. C. B. RAMA RAO :—"I do not wish to press it, being only a small amount."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Rao Bahadur Dr. C. B. RAMA RAO :—"Mr. President, I beg to move—

'8. That under amount of Rs. 31,000 under Detailed Account No. (32-d) Medical—Medical College and Schools—allotted to the introduction of a six months' course to Dental Assistant Surgeons be omitted (Budget, page 149).'

"My reasons are these. Dental surgery is partly a science and partly an art, and the greater part of it is mechanical. No decent medical man would undertake to do dental work. It is considered *infra dig* and so far as the scientific portion of it is concerned, there is not a single medical man who does not know the anatomy and physiology of the tooth. Where the difficulty and the speciality comes in, and where the dental surgeon is requisitioned, is when a curious tooth or some hollow in the tooth is the trouble. Then, all his amalgams, all his chemical combinations, all his implements of drilling and chiselling and so forth, come into operation. These are not the weapons which are handled by delicate surgeons.

[Dr. C. B. Rama Rao]

[26th March 1921]

They are assigned to separate people called dental surgeons, and I have visited hundreds of universities throughout the world and I do not know a single university where dental surgery has been made compulsory and even now we know that all assistant surgeons are given what is called study leave and such of those who choose to learn this in addition to their calling are welcome to take a special course in that subject and qualify themselves in it. But to spend thousands of rupees in travelling allowance, dislodging the hospital establishment and causing disturbance in the machinery of the working of the various public institutions time after time in bringing the assistant surgeon to a central place, I think it is not only unnecessary but a waste of public money. After all, what is gained, Sir, because, everybody, who has taken a course in dental surgery or watched a dental surgeon teaching his class, knows very well that the really important, secret, and the most, effectual part of it, is concealed. It is an art and it is a trade secret, and no man gives it out. I have recently been in correspondence with some students who have taken up this course in different medical schools and one of them has written to this effect, 'the setting of artificial teeth, bridging and crowning, are never taught. When these are not taught, I for one think that I have wasted six long precious months to learn what could have been learnt in four or six weeks.' This is what one of them says, and I know as a matter of fact that even in other countries it is considered a trade secret and it is not given out. I do not think that either the public or the individuals will benefit by such a cursory course. If one has to specialise in the dental surgery, it takes three years and he has to spend a bag of money. You have to pay your teacher in order to lead you into the secrecy.

"With these observations, I hope that this House will not look upon this resolution with the same lightness with which they treated the previous one, and will pass the dropping of this item."

MR. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—"Mr. President, instruction imparted in the Medical College has been imperfect, imperfect for many years. Formerly, only military assistant surgeons were taught dental surgery and the civil assistant surgeons went without that knowledge.

"Sir, the disease of the tooth has become so important now that almost every alimentary disease is attributed to it. The civil medical students are paying sufficiently and I do not see why the Government should not provide a separate dental surgery class for them and make them perfect when they go out into the world to discharge their duties."

RAO BAHADUR DR. C. B. RAMA RAO :—"It is true, Sir, that military assistant surgeons have been given a course of dental surgery for a long time. But I would like to know if there is even a single military assistant surgeon who is practising dental surgery as such. It was thought necessary to give the military assistant surgeons a little of that mechanical instruction in that department, because they are expected to deal with soldiers who have bad teeth generally, and the I.M.S. Officer or the R.A.M.C. Officer who is in charge does not want the bother of dealing with teeth. I may also say that military assistant surgeons are not looked upon by military surgeons in regiments as fully qualified medical men at all. They are treated more as we treat our compounders and ward boys. Therefore, it is a work assigned to the lower order of the profession, if it can be included in the profession at all. Therefore, I still persist in saying that it does not belong to the medical education proper and that it is outside it, and it is a speciality and if one wants to get the name of a specialist, he has to spend a large amount of money and devote three years and not six months for it."



26th March 1921] [The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. Todhunter]

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER :—"Sir, may I intervene in this discussion of the specialist's aspect of the question with a word from the point of view of the up-country sufferer from tooth-ache? The Honourable mover says that in Europe and America dentistry is a profession of itself and that dental surgery is not taught in the ordinary universities. That plan may be suitable, especially for America, where we know there are hundreds of dentists all over the country, but in India, while we have got no dentists up-country, there are plenty of bad teeth and when we get tooth-ache at a distance from a headquarter city, we want somebody to attend to us who will at least know how to pull the tooth out. I have a very painful recollection in my early days in this country of going to a doctor to have a tooth pulled out. It was a front tooth and the proper forceps for a front tooth is one in a single curve while the forceps for a back tooth has a double curve with a point in the middle that goes between the roots. The doctor to whom I had the misfortune to go took hold of my front tooth with a back tooth forceps and threw all his weight on to it with the result that the two points met in the middle of the tooth which was scattered in pieces all over the room. However much dental surgery may be a trade secret, I feel that such accidents could be avoided by teaching assistant surgeons the elements of the matter, such as how to pull out teeth properly. I therefore press for the retention of this course of dental surgery on behalf of the suffering public."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"As we have embarked on personal experiences may I add one of mine? When in July 1894 I was about to go to England on short leave I had a very severe attack of tooth-ache at Ootacamund, while the Civil Surgeon of Ootacamund emphatically a 'decent' medical man was attending me for tonsillitis. There was no dentist available and out of charity the Civil Surgeon, whose name will certainly be remembered by Dr. Rama Rao, for he was one of the most distinguished officers of the Indian Medical Service—afterwards Col. Browning—kindly consented to pull my tooth out for me. My experience was that he pulled out half of it and gave up the attempt to remove the other half in despair. It remained in my jaw till I got to England, causing extreme pain at the end of the journey. If Col. Browning had had a course of dental surgery, I might have been saved a great deal of the pain."

Rao Bahadur K. S. VENKATARAMA AYYAR :—"I have found that even sub-assistant surgeons are going on pulling the teeth of every patient that appears before them. I do not think any special training is necessary to pull out the teeth, though it is badly done in several cases. Government may give some select surgeons the necessary training every year so that they may be trained very well in the art. But the question is, as Dr. Rama Rao suggested, whether Government should spend money to train them so that they may become specialists and utilize that knowledge more for the purpose of their private practice than for using it in the ordinary duties of the hospital. I think, therefore, that if any person wants to qualify himself he ought to meet his own cost and the whole cost should not be borne by the Government. Government should consider whether full pay should be given, whether study leave should be given or whether any allowance should be given in such cases; but not incur the whole expenditure."

Mr. F. J. RICHARDS :—"Dr. C. B. Rama Rao's principal argument against this course of dental surgery is that it is beneath the dignity of a professional medical man. I ask the Council to consider whether such an argument will be convincing to any unfortunate person with an aching tooth who happens to be in Tinnevely or Mangalore or Berhampur while the nearest dental surgeon is in Madras. Even admitting, Sir, that the more delicate operations should be performed by a dental surgeon who has gone through a very lengthy course, it will

[Mr. F. J. Richards]

[26th March 1921]

save a great deal of suffering if, in these rather far-distant places, men are available who can perform minor surgical operations without inflicting unnecessary pain and save these people from the expense and torture of travelling all the way to Madras."

Rao Bahadur Dr. C. B. RAMA RAO:—"I may tell the House that I have myself extracted no less than thousand teeth. But where there is a cracked one I would not touch it. Every doctor does it. He does not go beyond that. But specialisation in dental surgery is quite a different thing. I do not think that any doctor will refuse to treat a patient who has got a pain in his teeth. But if it is a disease with structural changes in the teeth, I think the doctor would recommend going to the dentist."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT:—"The point is whether the Honourable Member wants to press his motion."

Rao Bahadur Dr. C. B. RAMA RAO:—"Either the provision should be increased to three lakhs and odd and the whole thing made really a thorough speciality or it may be deleted."

The Hon'ble Mr. P. RAMAKRISHNAN:—"Dr. Rama Rao takes credit for having pulled out several teeth. But he takes care to tell the House that he has pulled out only the loose teeth. At that rate I think many of us can also lay claim to have pulled out teeth. But the difficulty is to pull out the firm teeth. There it is that we should have recourse to a specialist. Dr. Rama Rao in his speech admitted that the dental surgery is more an art than a science. It is all the greater reason why we should train people in dentistry. After all we are training only a few people, so that they may be sent to outlying districts as dentists. As a matter of fact, last year in July there was an interpellation in this Council by one of the Honourable Members suggesting that a few assistant surgeons should be trained in dental surgery so that they might be sent to the mufassal districts. Five of the assistant surgeons were trained last year and the Government have sanctioned for the training of another batch and the course will begin from 1st April next. I think that it is the belief of many of the Honourable Members of this House that this is a step in the right direction. It is only those assistant surgeons who have a natural aptitude for this special branch that will be selected for this course. In these circumstances, I am sorry, Sir, that I cannot accept Dr. Rama Rao's motion."

Rao Bahadur Dr. C. B. RAMA RAO:—"In view of the remarks of the Hon'ble the Minister, I beg leave to withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"I beg to move—

'9. That the following alterations be made in 32 (d) Medical—Medical College and Schools:—

*Delete Rs. 21,600, teaching allowance for Assistant Professors (Budget page 150).'*

"This motion and the next one relate to the teaching allowance in the Medical College and the Medical Schools."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT:—"I think the Honourable Member had better confine himself to the first motion."

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"Both refer to the same thing."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT:—"I beg the Honourable Member's pardon. One refers to teaching allowance for Assistant Professors and the other to teaching allowance in medical schools. I prefer that the Hon'ble Member should confine himself to the motion which I called upon him to move."



26th March 1921] [Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar]

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—“ I was under the impression that some of these Professors were permanently employed in the Medical College and schools. I do not know how exactly the system is working. I wish to know how it is working. After hearing the answer for this, I will decide whether to press the motion to a division or not.”

Mr. F. J. RICHARDS:—“ Mr. President, Sir, first as to teaching allowances for Assistant Professors. These officers are Assistant Surgeons and they are granted an allowance of Rs 100 or Rs. 50 each per mensem. They form the nucleus from which lecturers for the medical schools are drawn. The allowance is necessary in order to induce capable assistant surgeons to take up the teaching profession foregoing all chances of private practice.”

“ The teaching allowance provided for medical schools is for six assistant lecturers in the Royapuram Medical School, who are sub-assistant surgeons. They are paid an allowance of Rs. 50 each per mensem, for the same reason for which an allowance is paid to the Professors and the Assistant Professors in the Medical College, i.e., to compensate them for the loss of private practice and to attract competent men to the teaching profession.

“ It is in the interests, Sir, of Medical education that competent men should be selected for teaching purposes. Unless some additional attraction is offered in the way of enhancement of pay to compensate the loss of private practice and the discontinuity in a professional career, the teaching profession will be unpopular. It may be urged that an assistant surgeon or sub-assistant surgeon of ability and merit may be compelled by force—because he is a Government servant—to take up the teaching duty in the Medical College or the schools. I do not think any one will seriously contend that such an arrangement, which will involve pecuniary loss and loss of professional prospects, will advance the interests of medical relief. It would certainly reduce the quality of teaching given. If teaching is to be made a punishment, as it would be if this motion is passed, it will be quite unreasonable to expect competent men to do their best, and teaching is I believe one of the difficult branches of work which the members of the Medical profession in the Government service have to do.”

Mr. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU:—“ I carefully heard the Hon'ble Mr. Richards about the necessity of paying duty allowances to Professors. But I have not been convinced as to the necessity. He says that the Professors are not allowed to have private practice. I extremely doubt the accuracy of the statement, because I know as a matter of fact that the Professors attached to the Vizagapatam Medical School are allowed private practice. I do not know if they are doing it in violation of the rules or whether they are doing it in ignorance of the rules. But the fact is they are having private practice. And he says we cannot draw the best man to the teaching staff. I wish to know how many instances there are where they could not get capable men for the teaching profession. In all these matters instead of drawing on the imagination for possible grounds why these allowances are given, it is better that the House should be furnished with facts and figures and told: ‘ We have so many applications. They are not satisfactory. They are not from very capable men. That is the reason why we are obliged to give duty allowances.’ That is the sort of convincing argument which should come from Government. There is no use coming forward with imaginary statements and saying that they are obliged to give allowance for this reason or that. I hope Government will come forward with convincing facts and figures as to the real need for the teaching allowance.”

[Mr. U. Rama Rao]

[26th March 1921]

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO:—"The Honourable Member that had just finished his speech did not understand Mr. Richards' speech correctly. All these Assistant Professors are allowed to practise, but they have not the time. For they have to go to the hospital work, in addition to teaching work in school. It is only a trifling amount, in one case Rs. 50 and in another case Rs. 10'. It is not that they are not allowed to practise, but they have not the time to practise. It is on that account this small amount is given."

Mr. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR:—"Sir, Mr. President, of all the professions under Government, the Medical profession is the most underpaid. Most of the medical students after graduating in arts struggle through a course, of five years to graduate in medicine. He has to struggle through this five years' course, and during that time he has to pass four examinations. The medical examinations are so very thorough, searching and minute, it is not possible for even clever students to go through the examinations in the first year. On an average he has to spend seven years in the Medical College. And then there is the further distillation of competitive examination. After undergoing these troubles what does he get? He is to get about Rs. 100 a month (now 200 they say). I learn from some of my friends that the department is not permanently graded. As long as they are in the mufassal, they get on but when they come to Madras their accommodation and conveyance charges take away all the Rs. 100. As to private practice, these are not the days of Dr. Koman's and Dr. Rama Rao's, when all the people in Madras were flocking to the assistant surgeons in the General Hospital. Now there are very able private medical practitioners. They will not allow the patients to slip into the hands of the Assistant Surgeons of the Hospital. This one hundred rupees is paid to these people for doing extra work in addition to their legitimate work as assistant surgeons, i.e., in addition to their having to attend to the patients in the hospital. Honourable Members know what it is to attend on patients in hospitals, and we all know what it is to prepare lectures for professional school or college. So the Rs. 100 given to them is nothing, even if it is in addition to the private practice allowed."

The Hon'ble Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR:—"I am rather surprised at the attitude of some of the Honourable Members. Only the other day when there was a debate on the desirability or otherwise of the allowances granted to the Deputy Collectors and others they said if allowances are to be given they must be to doctors and others. To-day I am surprised to see some of the Members taking objection to the allowance to doctors. Really, Sir, I am more than convinced that if allowances are due in any case, they are really due in the case of professional and medical men, particularly doctors. They have to sit at the class room for hours together. If, on the other hand, they are at liberty to practise they may earn a great deal more. So, in these circumstances, if we really want men of ability to teach our pupils in schools we must make the pay attractive. The pay as is now given to the assistant surgeons and civil surgeons is not at all attractive. Therefore it is absolutely necessary that there should be something extra allowed to those who take to the profession of teaching."

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"There is some confusion. Is it that some allowance is given for the extra work they are doing in addition to their ordinary work or is it that they are permanent schoolmasters who are given an allowance as they cannot or are not on account of their work allowed to practise?"



26th March 1921]

[Mr. U. Rama Rao]

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—"The assistant and sub-assistant surgeons are made to work in hospitals for five and six hours. In addition to that, for purposes of teaching in schools and colleges they are paid extra from Rs. 50 to Rs. 100. They are allowed to have private practice, but they do not have the time."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The following motions were not made and were deemed to have been withdrawn :—

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

'10. Delete Rs. 3,600 teaching allowance in Medical Schools (Budget page 151).'

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—

'11. That in the demand under "32-d. Medical—Medical College and Schools", the grant of Rs. 1,660 proposed for allowance to officers in the Royapetta Hospital for imparting clinical instruction to Sub-Assistant Surgeon pupils be omitted (Budget page 151).'

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—

'12. (iv) 32-d. Duty allowance to gymnastic instructor, Vizagapatam Medical School (Budget page 151) ... Omit Rs. 12).'

Mr. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—

'13. (iii) under 32-a. Medical—Medical College and Schools—  
To gymnastic instructor in the Vizagapatam School  
(Budget page 151) ... Omit Rs. 120.'

Rao Bahadur Dr. C. B. RAMA RAO moved—

'14. That the amount of Rs. 90,000 allotted under Detailed Account No. 32-d (ii). Medical Schools, for stipends and books for civil pupils, be omitted (Budget page 152).'

In doing so, he said :—"Mr. President, I am aware that out of the four classes in each of the medical schools, the students of the three upper classes have already been there under a certain agreement, and they are bound by that agreement until their course is over. It would be possible of course to dispense with the agreement only with regard to the students who will enter in the coming academic year, and in regard to them, the Honourable the Minister in charge has already told us that he would accept the principle of this recommendation. What I should like to place before the House is that a further attempt may be made with regard to those students who are already in the three upper classes whether they could not be asked to forego their stipends in view of their being given the option to serve in one of the five divisions into which the Presidency may be divided for purposes of medical transfers. As I said some time ago, one feels it rather hard to ask them to go from, say, Tinnevely to Ganjam. No public purpose would be served by sending a Tamilian to Ganjam and pay him travelling allowance. So I thought if the Presidency could be divided into four linguistic areas with a central block for Madras and the surrounding districts and each student be asked to choose his own centre of 3 or 4 districts, he might in consideration of that advantage forego his stipends. Dispensaries and hospitals in these 4 or 5 districts will come up to nearly 200, and there won't be any difficulty felt in managing the administration. With these few remarks, I beg to move this resolution, not for acceptance, but for the approval of the House that the policy indicated in it

[Dr. C. B. Rama Rao]

[26th March 1921]

may be pursued in future years in an increasing degree until at the end of the next four years all students in the medical schools will be paying students with no stipend. As a general rule stipends should be given only to deserving students as encouragement of merit rather than as a mamul."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—"Mr. President, I beg to support the motion on different grounds altogether. First of all, no doubt we are getting a large number of private students entering this L.M.P. class, and secondly the moment these stipendiary students are chosen to undergo training in a medical school they are to execute a bond, not by themselves, but by their parents or guardians to the effect that they will undergo a course of training for four years, and at the end of four years they would give a further agreement to serve Government for 10 years. This is a sort of indentured labour. I would even go to the extent of calling it slavery. Here is a new term of agreement according to which he is bound to serve anywhere instead of only in British India or the Dependencies and that the period of the bond should be increased from 5 to 10 years and that the amount of the bond should be increased wherever necessary to Rs. 1,000 and also further, whoever may hereafter be appointed to the service should be required to execute a bond in the revised form. After passing the examination, not only he is to execute a bond, but also to furnish two sureties for Rs. 1,000 each. Here is G.O. No. 544, Medical, relating to it. This change has been made in order to meet suggestions that few students would be in a position to find the one thousand rupees. In this connexion I may also observe further that the sub-assistant surgeon himself should execute the bond as one of the sureties. These medical men after undergoing the four years' training not only they are asked to go all over India and all over the British Dominions but they are not paid anything extra. We have got instances of ill-treatment of sub-assistant surgeons during war. During the war these young men had done remarkably useful work and were not given proper allowances, whereas medical men of the same cadre but belonging to other class, were treated in a quite different way altogether. I have hundreds of instances where the civil sub-assistant surgeons are ill-treated. So, on this account alone, Mr. President, I strongly support this resolution.

"This system was introduced at a time when we were not in a position to get enough men for the the sub-assistant surgeon's cadre. Now, in every medical school, they want only fifty while the number of applications is 500 or so. Such being the case, this indentured labour system should become a thing of the past. With these few remarks I support the motion."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"Mr. President, after hearing the previous two speakers, I think a case has been made out for the revision of the terms under which these students are recruited, but I do not see the need for doing away with these scholarships altogether. I come from districts which have been referred to by the Honourable Members for Government as backward districts. I think it is very necessary that special inducements should be held out to students of those districts to train themselves in medicine and also to students from such communities as are not represented in the medical profession at all. Take for instance, the Lingayat community. I have found in the course of my work that it is very difficult for a dispensary to be made popular in places where there is a strong Lingayat population. I think it will go a great way to induce them to take advantage of it if the dispensary is in charge of one of their own men. So I think that these scholarships should be retained but better arrangements should be made for the distribution and the terms of recruitment may also be revised."



26th March 1921] [The Hon'ble Mr. P. Ramarayananingar]

The Hon'ble Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—“Sir, from the discussion that has taken place in the House I see that a case has been made out for mending the system of stipends to the medical pupils but not ending it. I have no doubt that there is a great deal of force in saying that the system is capable of improvement. I know very well that certain districts do not care to send their young men to medical colleges and schools for medical education so that when they come out from these schools and colleges, they can either practise or accept appointments in their own districts. The Ceded Districts are the districts wherefrom you get very few pupils and students. In the matter of stipending students such districts require special treatment. Besides, certain communities are very badly represented in the profession. Take the case of the Adi Dravida community. There are very few assistant surgeons or sub-assistant surgeons in that community. If we are in a position to give them special incentive to take to medical education we would be able to prepare a number of medical men who would go to cherries and the Government may be able to give medical relief to the people there. Under these circumstances, I am quite prepared to consider the question of mending the system. I trust with this assurance the Honourable the mover will withdraw his resolution.”

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—“Sir, my object in rising to speak on this resolution was only to draw attention to the system of admission to these schools. I remember about 25 years ago when boys found that they could not get promotion from the IVth or Vth form, they could easily get scholarships and admission into the medical schools. It was very difficult then to get young men to go to medical schools and colleges, without inducement. But now in these days there is such a rush of people who are able to pay and who have passed the School Final or Matriculation or even Intermediate Examination that for every four or five applicants only one is able to get admission. Especially in view of the fact that Mr. U. Rama Rao pointed out, namely, that these students on getting admission are made to sign bonds by which they bind themselves to serve the Government for a long term it is but right that the whole system should be revised. While people are willing to come to the colleges paying their own money, why should not the money spent on scholarships be released and applied for purposes where the need is great? As regards the backward districts or backward classes such as the Adi Dravidas and the Ceded Districts, special provision may be made for them also. As the Hon'ble the Minister said that he is going to consider the whole question, it is not necessary to press the motion for a division.”

Rao Bahadur Dr. C. B. RAMA RAO :—“After the assurance given by the Minister there is no necessity to press this motion.”

Motion No. 14 was by leave withdrawn.

The following motions Nos. 15 and 16 were also by leave withdrawn :—

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

‘15. That under 32-D (ii). Medical, the provision of Rs. 90,000 for stipends and books of civil pupils be reduced by Rs. 100 (Budget page 152).’

Mr. M. C. RAJA :—

‘16. That under 32-D (ii). Medical, the provision of Rs. 90,000 for stipends and books of civil pupils be reduced by Rs. 100 (Budget page 152).’

[Mr. M. C. Raja]

[26th March 1921]

The following motions were deemed to have been withdrawn, the movers not being present :—

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

'17. That under 32-D. Medical—Medical College and Schools—Stipends and books of civil pupils, the provision of Rs. 90,000 be reduced by Rs. 100 (Budget page 152).'

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

'18. That the demand for Rs. 90,000 for stipends and books of civil pupils under 32-D. be reduced to one rupee (Budget page 152).'

Mr. M. C. RAJA moved—

'19. That under 31-D (ii). Medical, the provision of Rs. 4,648 for stipends of Madras-Burma pupils be reduced by Rs. 5 (Budget page 152).'

In doing so, he said :—"The object in giving notice of this motion is that stipends are intended for Madras and Burma pupils and not for Madras pupils alone. These pupils after training go away to Burma and serve there. I do not see any reason why the Madras Government should set apart Rs. 4,648 to be given as stipends for people whose services will not be utilized by us but by the Burma Government."

The Hon'ble Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—"The Burma stipends were instituted some years back and as a matter of fact when the Government of India fixed the provincial settlement to Madras they took Madras expenditure on Burma pupils into consideration and increased the Madras allotments to that extent whereas they reduced the Burma allotment by that amount. The institution of stipendiary system was based upon special principle. The reason why Burma insisted upon its own medical service being trained in Madras is that in Madras they could have the best training. That is really a compliment to Madras. (A voice : we have been paying for it.) No, we have not been paying for it because we have been getting credit for it in the financial settlement. When the financial settlement system came to an end there was reason for complaint. However for the last three years there have been no new additions to Burma pupils to the Medical Schools. It is only the last year's batch that are being given stipends now. With this year the whole thing will come to an end. The amount that we are spending this year is about Rs. 4,000 and I do not think it is worth our while to discuss it and even this Rs. 4,000 we can demand and get from Burmese Government. I trust that my Honourable friend will withdraw his motion."

Mr. M. C. RAJA :—"I thank the Hon'ble Minister for giving a very favourable answer. I withdraw the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The following motion standing in the name of Mr. O. Tanikachala Chetti was not moved and was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

'20. That under 32-D (ii). Medical, the provision of Rs. 4,648 for stipends of Madras-Burma pupils be reduced by Rs. 5.'

The following motion was deemed to have been withdrawn owing to the absence of Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar :—

21. That under 32-D. Medical—Medical College and Schools, the provision of Rs. 648 for stipends of Madras-Burma pupils be omitted.'

Rao Sabib U. RAMA RAO :—"Mr. President, I move—

'22. That the grant of Rs. 6,07,793 in 32 (a) be reduced by Rs. 8,000.'



26th March 1921]

[Mr. U. Rama Rao]

"Sir, I move this motion more with the object of eliciting the policy of the present Government in the matter of medical administration. Medicine is a transferred subject and it is in charge of a Minister. In spite of the Morley despatch and the Public Services Commission report to the effect that more Indians should be employed in the public service in the Department of Medicine, it is an unfortunate thing, Sir, that very few higher appointments are open to Indians at all. It is an unfortunate thing that this department is overburdened with military medical men. To make room for military medical men a number of places have been reserved for Indian Medical Service men. In no department of the Government the claim of the Indians is more ignored than in this department. Graduates in Law and Engineering and other departments, if they are only clever enough, they can occupy the highest post in the land. A medical graduate with Indian or English qualifications or all the qualifications put together, cannot aspire to any post higher than that of a civil surgeon, in his life."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODDhunter :—"May I ask, Sir, what prevents him from getting into the Indian Medical Service?"

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO (*continuing*) :—"If he wants to get into the Indian Medical Service, he will have to go to England. The best brains always do not go with money. People who have brains have no money. The best brains are here and they cannot go all the way from here and undergo the training. That is the reason why many Indians are not able to go to England and pass the examination there. The qualification here is not in any way inferior to the qualification there. To give an instance, although a man does not get through the L. M. & S. degree examination here, he goes to England, sits for the L.R.C.P. or M.R.C.P. & S. examination and competes for the Indian Medical Service and comes back here as an Indian Medical Service man. It is an example to show that there are capable men with brains, but unfortunately they have not got the money. Mr. President, all important appointments with fat pay are reserved to military men. The result is there is no scope for Indian medical men to get into higher appointments or appointments of any responsibility. But at the same time, I must point out here, Sir, that there are many Indians who are equally capable, if not superior to the men of the Indian Medical Service grade. I have no complaint against Indian Medical Service men. Some of the Indian Medical Service men are excellent men. In fact, most of us had learnt our medicine at the feet of Indian Medical Service men but I must tell you, Sir, with due deference to medical men, that there are many Indians who can equally compete with members of the Indian Medical Service. This war has conclusively proved that Indians are able to manage any hospital, perform any operations, manage any department under the Government. The higher post in the General Hospital, those of Surgeons, Bacteriologist, etc., and the work therein has been managed without any bad remark either from the people or from the Government including Indian Medical Service men. Such being the case, Sir, I plead that this new transferred Government will consider that more appointments are given to Indians. As a matter of fact, 53 appointments are reserved for Indian Medical Service men and eight appointments only are available to the civil assistant surgeons, when there are no Indian Medical Service men available — mark the words 'when there are no Indian Medical Service men available' — Indian Medical Service men are always available. So, the assistant surgeons get these appointments very rarely."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"May I ask the Honourable member to quote some authority for his statement that Indian Medical Service men are always available. I have a recollection that they were not available many times."

[Mr. U. Rama Rao]

[26th March 1921]

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO:—"I never said 'always available'. They are always available except during the time of war, when we managed the work entirely ourselves.

"There is another hardship, which I do not press on the House, as regards the military assistant surgeons. After all, they are Indians, and I have little complaint in this respect. In fact, I have a little complaint and that is, that the military assistant surgeons, though they get an inferior training to that of the Indian graduates, sometimes they are placed over the civil assistant surgeons. These men are only diploma holders, because they have done military service in the army, they are given higher appointments carrying very fat pay. I have nothing to complain against them because they are Indians after all.

"I know, Sir, the new Ministry can have no policy in the matter till the Government of India and the higher authorities are moved in the matter. All these appointments are listed as a military reserve. But I do not see any reason why civil assistant surgeons should not be appointed to those places with the condition that whenever needed for military purposes they are bound to go. If this provision is made, all this extra medical expenditure could be cut short.

"Then, Sir, I want to give some figures before I close. For 28 Indian Medical Service officers we are spending Rs. 4.63 lakhs, whereas for 79 officers of assistant surgeons, apothecaries, etc., we are spending Rs. 2.30 lakhs. That is so far as appointments are concerned.

"Then going to the Medical colleges, in the Medical College, 12 professors draw a sum of Rs. 1.24 lakhs whereas 31 assistant professors draw only a sum of 54 thousands. In the Medical College all the professorial chairs are occupied by the members of the Indian Medical Service except one. I want to know whether there are not Indians who have gone to England and qualified themselves for the post by undergoing special training. Are there no Indians fit to be in charge of any of these chairs? In fact during the war time some of those Indians had occupied the chair and had worked remarkably well. Then, Sir, if the Indian Medical Service officers are to be provided with appointments for military purposes, by all means let the Government of India bear the cost of their salaries so that this Provincial Government may be relieved of this heavy burden. I hope Sir, that the Ministers will perpetuate their memory by enunciating a new policy and by indianizing the medical service. With this in view, Sir, I am bringing forward this motion.

"There is one other point. At page 141 of the budget for the year 1920-21 only Rs. 8,700 is provided for one Personal Assistant to the Surgeon-General. In this year's budget, a sum of Rs. 13,200 is provided. Usually an Indian Medical Service officer of the Captain rank fills the place but now an Indian Medical Service officer of the Major rank has been appointed and that is the reason why we are paying him so heavily."

Mr. F. J. RICHARDS:—"Sir, I am rather bewildered at having to answer my Hon'ble friend Mr. U. Rama Rao's complaint, because obviously I have had no hint at all, in the form which his resolution takes, that it would resolve itself into an attack on the Indian Medical Service."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO:—"No attack on the Indian Medical Service officers at all. I only stated the facts."

Mr. F. J. RICHARDS:—"I am afraid, Sir, that I am quite unable to construe in any other sense the words he uttered."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO:—"Even the Indian Medical Service officers had a chance of giving place to Indians. But they have not done so."



26th March 1921]

[Mr. F. J. Richards]

Mr. F. J. RICHARDS :—“ Is my friend in order in interrupting me like this ?

“ I confess, I am rather amazed that such things should have been said about Indian Medical Service officers. Of course in attacking the Indian Medical Service my honourable friend was attacking many very distinguished Indian officers. The Indian Medical Service is open to Indians and Indians can go to England and qualify themselves for it and they have done so. As a matter of fact at the present time it seems to me that the complaint raised by my honourable friend will solve itself because in the present conditions there is very great difficulty in procuring officers for the Indian Medical Service and I do not think that any action can be taken by this House or by the Government to the prejudice of a service which, I believe, is regulated by the Secretary of State in consultation with the Government of India. As for privileges given to men who serve in the army, it has not been my duty to do that myself and I do not think my friend Mr. Rama Rao has done so either. But I can quite realize, Sir, that medical officers who have served with the army have gone through hardships and difficulties which entitle them to special consideration and I do not think any one in this House will grudge special recognition of services rendered in the war.

“ Another point which I wish to bring to the notice of this House is that during the past few years, owing to difficulties in securing Indian Medical Service men, there has been an enormous saving in the pay of Indian Medical Service officers, despite the fact that many of them have been working themselves into sickness by doing the duty of three or four or even five men. In saying these things, Sir, I do not wish in any way to disparage the work which has been done and which is being done by the assistant surgeons. My experiences as a District officer are limited to the two years when I was in charge of the North Arcot district. My experience was that both as a professional man and as an administrative officer the provincial service officer who was stationed in the district conducted himself admirably and I am quite sure that my experience is shared by a very large number of other District officers.

“ Exception has been taken to the increase in the pay of the Personal Assistant to the Surgeon-General. I may inform my honourable friend that it was extremely difficult to get anybody to take up that job at all. The job has become extremely arduous and if I am asked why it is so, I would point out that not only has there been a considerable development recently in the medical administration in order to bring it up-to-date and to suit modern requirements but there are also infinite difficulties in selecting the best men for all grades owing to the long continued shortage of officers, which I hope will soon be remedied ; but the Government have also undertaken the administration of financial responsibility for twenty-five headquarter district hospitals and if this additional liability is taken, it is inevitable that extra hands should be employed to carry it out and that will involve extra work. I do not think I need say anything further in this connexion. I hope that the House will give its assent to the passing of the Medical budget. The Medical department has in the past been regarded as the Cinderella of the departments. I hope that in consideration of the enormous cost of qualified men this budget may be passed.”

Rao Bahadur Dr. C. B. RAMA RAO :—“ Mr. President, with regard to the point raised by my Hon'ble friend Mr. U. Rama Rao, I have to say that he covered a much wider ground than I thought he would, because his point was only with reference to the appointment of the Personal Assistant. No doubt it has been usual in the years past, except in very recent years to have only a Captain as

[Dr. C. B. Rama Rao]

[26th March 1921]

Personal Assistant. When the war broke out and when there was a paucity of Indian Medical Service officers, I happened to have a talk on certain matters of administration with Sir Alexander Cardew who was then the Member in charge of the portfolio; I told him that in all other departments the personal assistants to the heads of departments were provincial men and that the same practice could be introduced in the Medical department also. He quite approved of it. But why it was not given effect to, I do not know.

"As to the other matters, I am sorry that my Hon'ble friend Mr. Richards should have thought that it was an attack on Indian Medical Service officers. It was nothing of the kind and in not one of the statements was there any attack meant. We have had the best of understandings and as he said we all received our education at the feet of Indian Medical Service officers and among them we count our best friends. What we object to is not individual officers but the principle of having a military officer on our heads. They come with military ideas, military discipline, military interest and always military goal and they have no abiding interest in the department or in the country or in the profession. If they get tired of any one thing they at once go back. I hope I will not be divulging any public secret when I tell you that the last Sanitary Commissioner did not do any work because he thought he was more military than civil and he did not quite like this appointment."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"Is not this rather defamatory, Sir? I do not think our rules have been so amended as to admit defamatory matter."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT:—"I see nothing defamatory."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"What the speaker said was that he was not divulging a secret when he stated that the last Sanitary Commissioner had done no work at all, and actually took credit for it."

Rao Bahadur C. B. RAMA RAO:—"I said something to that effect and I do stick to it now. I had a long talk with him and I went to him two or three times to see him in his office but I was told he never went to office. This is what he himself said. This is not what I have heard from one officer, Sir, but from many. I do not wish to go into personalities; otherwise I can surprise you by making a series of revelations. But it is not my purpose. My purpose is to make the Members of the Government, the President, the whole House and the whole public trust me when I say that we have no complaint whatever against any individual officer or any person or even against the services. But we do object to the military service domineering over the civil service and keeping us down and not allowing us to expand."

The Council then adjourned to 11 a.m. on Monday, the 26th day of March 1921.

L. D. SWAMIKANNU,  
Secretary to the Legislative Council.



